THE I.L.P. AND THE COMINTERN

VOLUME X

No 20

October 15th, 1933

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

TEN CENTS

CONTENTS OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number **20**

Published fortnightly in Russian, German, French, Chinese, Spanish and English.

1. HEARTY GREETINGS TO COMRADE D. Z. MANUILSKY, ONE OF THE MOST PROMINENT LEADERS OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, ON HIS FIFTIETH BIRTHDAY

(*See page* 667)

I.L.P. AND THE COMINTERN

2. NOTE TO THE LETTERS PUBLISHED

(*See page* 670)

3. THE REPLY OF THE BRITISH I.L.P. TO THE COMINTERN

(*See page* 672)

4. TO THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY

(*See page* 673)

5. THE AGITATIONAL WORK OF THE C.P.G.B.

(*See page* 677)

6. THE LONDON "DAILY WORKER"

By W. Rust (*See page* 683)

7. THE ROOSEVELT PROGRAMME OF INDUSTRIAL "RECOVERY"

By Leon Platt (*See page* 687)

8. OUR ATTITUDE TO THE SOCIAL-FASCIST BOYCOTT CAMPAIGN

(*See page* 697)

9. A NEW PHASE IN THE REVOLUTIONARY EVENTS IN CUBA

By G. Sinani (*See page* 700)

HEARTY GREETINGS TO COMRADE D. Z. MANUILSKY ONE OF THE MOST PROMINENT LEADERS OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT ON HIS FIFTIETH BIRTHDAY

THE TIRELESS FIGHTER FOR THE CAUSE OF THE WORKING CLASS.

TO-DAY is the fiftieth anniversary of the rich revolutionary life of COMRADE D. Z. MANUILSKY. With burning energy and enthusiasm, with inexhaustible initiative and Bolshevik decision, he fights in the front ranks of the proletariat of the world, in whose international party—the Communist International—he has occupied for a decade a responsible guiding post. Out of the revolutionary movement of the Russian and Ukrainian proletariat, out of the theory and practice of the Bolsheviks, he has brought a rich fighting experience into the international class struggle.

Soon after entering the Social-Democratic movement, in 1904, he took an active part in the struggle against the tsarist autocracy, and in 1905 was arrested in St. Petersburg as one of the organisers of a demonstration against the Russo-Japanese War. After his release he continues to work in the Bolshevik organisations, and in 1906 takes part in the Kronstadt rising, demonstrating his fearlessness and the quick wits which never deserted him in his struggle against the class enemy. After escaping from prison, he continues to work in Kiev, but is soon forced to emigrate.

In the fight against international imperialism, for the cause of the world proletariat, Comrade Manuilsky has continued to manifest the boldness and the self-sacrifice which was his outstanding attribute in the first years of his Bolshevik work and revolutionary struggle.

After a very difficult period of emigration, we find him again in Russia, in the front rank of fighters for the proletarian revolution, in Krassnoye Selo, a Commissar of the Red Guards, which defended the first victories of the proletarian revolution against the troops of Kerensky, near Leningrad. During the armed intervention of international imperialism against the Republic of the Soviets, Comrade Manuilsky, heading a mission of the Red Cross, was interned in France. During the years following we find him in the most difficult posts in the Ukraine, taking part in the struggle against international imperialism, against world counter-revolution. In 1920 he works as member of the Military Council of the Ukraine, where imperialist counter-revolution again attempted to create a point of departure in its attack against the Republic of the Soviets. Since 1920 he is a member of the C.C. of the Communist Party of the Ukraine. Since the Twelfth Congress of the Party he is a member of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.

As one of the leaders of the Communist International, Comrade Manuilsky takes part in solving the most important questions of the international revolutionary labour movement and gives an example of how the decisions on these questions should be carried out in the struggle for winning over the majority of the working class, for the victory of the proletarian revolution. The sections of the C.I., whose complex problems were solved under his guidance, can comment not only on his Bolshevik erudition, his acute political insight and piercing intellect, but also his understanding of the concrete situation in every part of the struggle, his tact in the understanding of internal Party questions, his warm comradely attitude towards those who are subjected to the bloody persecution of the counter-revolution.

We wish Comrade Manuilsky further successful struggles in the leading ranks of the international proletariat.

Katayama	Stasova	Angaretis
Pyatnitsky	Winestone	Hansen
Marty	Rust	Mickevicz
Knorin	Kolarov	Iskrov
Kuusinen	Kostanyan	Manner
Bela Kun	Belevsky	Maggi
Heckert	Okano	Romero
Lozovsky	Hopner	Grossman
Wan min	Dengel	Tskhakaya
Gallo	Chemodanov	Postma

GREETING OF THE C.C. OF THE C.P.S.U TO COM. MANUILSKY.

The C.C. of the C.P.S.U. warmly greets the old Bolshevik, tried in battles for the cause of proletarian revolution, one of the most prominent leaders of the international Communist

movement, COM. MANUILSKY, on his fiftieth birthday.

C.C. of the C.P.S.U.

ONE OF THE ORGANISERS OF THE SOVIET POWER IN THE UKRAINE.

We warmly greet DIMITRI ZAKHAROVICH MANUILSKY on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday.

The Party organisation of the Ukraine knows and loves COM. MANUILSKY as a devoted Bolshevik, as one of the organisers of the Soviet power in the Ukraine, as one of its leaders in the most difficult years of the Civil War and the first years of peaceful Socialist construction, as a steadfast, uncompromising fighter for the general line of the Party and the Comintern, against opportunism and nationalism, against all enemies of the working class.

We are convinced that, for many years to come COM. MANUILSKY will be able to serve our Bolshevik Leninist Party and the cause of the world proletarian revolution as devotedly and truly as he has done up to now.

Kossior, Postyshev, Petrovsky, Chubar, Balitsky, Yakir, Zatonsky, Sukhomlin, Chuvyrin, Popov, N. Lyubchenko, Schlichter.

D. Z. MANUILSKY

Communist Parties and the Crisis of Capitalism (11th Plenum)	1s. 0d.	35 cts.
The Soviet Union and the World's Workers (12th Plenum) ...	2d.	5 cts.
Marxism—Doctrine of Proletarian Dictatorship (50th Anniversary Marx)	2d.	5 cts.
Social-Democracy—Stepping-Stone to Fascism (Reply to Otto Bauer)	2d.	5 cts.
The C.P. of Germany Lives and Fights	2d.	5 cts.
Four Weeks in the Hands of Hitler's Hell-Hounds (Beimler)	3d.	10 cts.
The Far East Ablaze (G. Safarov)	2d.	5 cts.
Dissolution of the Second International (Bela Kun)	6d.	20 cts.

O. PIATNITSKY

The World Economic Crisis	9d., 1s. 6d.	30 cts.
The Present Situation in Germany	3d.	10 cts.
The 21 Points of the "C.I."	1d.	3 cts.

SHORTLY

Lenin on the I.L.P.

The Toilers Against War (Klara Zetkin).

COMRADE D. Z. MANUILSKY.

NOTE TO THE LETTERS PUBLISHED

WE publish below the letter of the National Administrative Council of the I.L.P. to the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. and the letter of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. to the I.L.P. in answer to the letter of the Administrative Council, explaining the true nature of the policy of the I.L.P. leadership and again explaining how the members of the I.L.P. can carry the decision of the annual conference at Derby on assisting the work of the Communist International into practice.

In order that the reader may orientate himself better in the questions dealt with in the letter of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. we shall briefly recall the facts which prompted the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. to address this letter to the Independent Labour Party and to point out how the Chairman of the I.L.P., Mr. Brockway, responded to this letter. At the annual conference of the I.L.P. in Derby a resolution was adopted by the majority of the conference, and in spite of the opposition of the I.L.P. leadership, on assisting the work of the Comintern and of the C.P.G.B. Following the conference's decision to leave the Second International, and the Address to the Comintern, the Secretariat of the Comintern sent a telegram greeting the decision of the conference, as a political step of great importance, and expressing the hope that the I.L.P. would prove of real assistance in the work of the Comintern and of the C.P.G.B.

However, the N.A.C. limited itself to formally sending the E.C.C.I. the text of the conference's resolution, and made no proposals for carrying out the decision of the conference. And then, after receiving a detailed and concrete reply from the Comintern to its question of how the I.L.P. could assist the work of the Comintern, the N.A.C. sent the letter published below, which, far from dealing with this basic question, contained a series of absolutely unfounded charges against the Comintern.

Since the National Council wrote this second letter to the Comintern, it has shown the real meaning of its policy by its own deeds. During August its representatives took part in the international conference of "Left" Social-Fascist and Trotskyist organisations in Paris, where, incident the formation of a new Two-and-a-Half International was discussed and a counter-revolutionary programme, directed against the Comintern, cooked up. It is true that the I.L.P. leaders did not directly endorse the official resolution of this conference, but only because they preferred to attack the C.I. by a more subtle manoeuvre.

On the one hand, Brockway writes articles violently attacking the Comintern, the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.G., and on the other I.L.P. delegation at the Paris Conference declares that it does not as yet raise the question of creating a Two-and-a-Half International, but that, "if the Third International proves unable to change its tactics and organisation, the time will have come to consider the formation of a new international."

This propaganda carried on by the National Council, which continues, nevertheless, to declare its loyalty to the united front with the Communist Party of Great Britain, coincides with the renewed attempts of the openly Right-wing group of leaders to break down the united front. These leaders are operating in every possible way, and, incidentally, through their supporters in the district committees. Several district secretaries have come to an agreement on the question of organising common action against the united front, and have already succeeded in getting a small majority (31-26) for their line at the Lancashire conference. In South Wales the district leaders of the I.L.P. have refused to discuss further the question of joint action with the Communist Party.

The "Left" majority of the National Council has formally condemned the attitude of the Lancashire leadership, but this condemnation has no practical significance, as it is precisely the line of the National Council that provided a basis for the Right wing saboteurs. Thus "Left" and Right, in fact, play into each other's hands.

This position which was adopted by the leadership of the I.L.P. and which contradicts the resolution of the annual Derby conference of the I.L.P., prompted the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. to address to the I.L.P. the letter published below, which points out that "some parts of the letter of the N.A.C. to us, and statements of prominent members of the N.A.C. (Brockway, Sandham, Jowett, etc.) during recent months, the breaking off of the united front with the Communists by some leading functionaries of the I.L.P., give grounds for fearing that the intention of the Derby Conference to assist in the work of the Communist International may be frustrated."

The Comintern letter deals in a comradely way with all the questions raised by the I.L.P. and its leadership.

It again emphasises the sincere desire of the Comintern to fight for the united front, exposes the I.L.P. saboteurs, who are breaking down the united front of the struggle of the working class, exposes the "Left" reformists and asks the Inde-

pendent Labour Party to discuss thoroughly the question of affiliating to the Communist International as a sympathising party.

After the publication of this letter of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I., the leader of the Independent Labour Party, Mr. Fenner Brockway, published an article in the "New Leader" of September 29th in which he attempts partly to obscure and partly to distort the essence of the letter of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I.

In his article Mr. Brockway completely ignores the shattering criticism of the policy of the I.L.P. leadership which is given in the letter of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. He also evades a direct answer to the question of the I.L.P's affiliation to the Communist International as a sympathising party, and only indirectly hints that he is against the proposal. Instead of saying openly whether he is for or against affiliating to the Comintern, he hides cowardly behind the mass of the I.L.P. membership, which, allegedly, "are more enthusiastically behind the National Council than they have ever been," and he is sure "that it is the I.L.P. which must be the driving force of Revolutionary Socialist activity in this country."

Prudently evading all discussion of the substance of the matter, Mr. Brockway puts forward two formal charges against the letter of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. First, he reproaches the E.C.C.I. for addressing its letter, not to the National Council, but to the Independent Labour Party, i.e., to the masses of its membership over the heads of its leaders, for in this he sees an attempt to set the membership masses against the leaders, an attempt to split the Independent Labour Party. It is, however, permissible to ask Mr. Brockway why a direct address to the membership of the party should lead to their conflict with the leadership and to a split in the party. Is it because the political line of the I.L.P. leadership differs from the political mood of the majority of the I.L.P. membership; because the leadership of the I.L.P. is, in fact, sabotaging the decision of the Derby conference, which reflected the mood of the majority of the I.L.P. membership Because the policy of the I.L.P. leaders is leading to a split in the united revolutionary front for struggle which the mass of the members want?

The second formal charge which Mr. Brockway puts forward against the letter of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. is that this letter, following in the footsteps of the "Daily Worker," distorts the character of the world congress which the I.L.P. wants to call and for which preparations were made at the Paris Conference. The idea is not, Mr. Brockway tells us, "to secure an all-inclusive International in which reformist Social-Democrats and revolutionary Socialists shall be combined," but to secure "co-operation with Comintern, and, second . . . with the revolutionary parties and groups outside Comintern." Mr. Brockway is now attempting to interpret "the unity congress," which the I.L.P. leadership is getting up, in a narrower sense than it would appear to mean in the letter of the National Administrative Council of the I.L.P. to the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I., which reads as follows: "For this purpose we propose to call an international congress of all organisations which are prepared to collaborate on a revolutionary Socialist basis. We shall be inviting the Communist Parties, together with other sections of the working class, to send representatives to this congress. We hope that the Communist International will be ready to participate, with the object of developing united action by *the international working class movement* (italics ours—Ed.) against Fascism, etc."

But let us suppose that in speaking about establishing united action "of the international working class movement" the leadership of the I.L.P. did not include under this heading "reformist social-democrats," but only meant collaboration with the Comintern, on the one hand, and with "revolutionary parties and groups who are outside the Comintern" on the other. But who are these "revolutionary parties and groups outside the Comintern"? This must be deciphered if we are not to play hide-and-seek. These "revolutionary parties and groups, are, evidently (1) independent fragments of the Social-Democratic parties, which claim to be "Left" and at the same time carry out the same old Social-Fascist policy, only more elaborately disguised; and (2) the renegades from Communism, Brandlerites and counter-revolutionary Trotskyists, who have now found a warm welcome in the columns of the "New Leader."

Of the policy of such a Unity International one can judge by the political speeches and writings of Mr. Brockway himself, which are referred to in the letter of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. In the columns of the "New Leader" of June 16 and July 7, Mr. Brockway has put forward slanderous accusations against the Comintern, the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government.

Mr. Brockway said in these articles that, as the Comintern is led by the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.S.U. adapts itself to the policy of the Soviet Government, which, he tells us, defends the limited national interests of the U.S.S.R. and contradicts the principles of internationalism, the Comintern deserts the positions of international-

ism. To prove this disgraceful slander Mr. Brockway referred, first, to the Comintern's "sanctioning" the policy of the Soviet Government in the latter's recognition of Manchukuo, as he says, while other countries refused to recognise this state which had been forcibly formed by Japan. (Incidentally, this is an absolute lie, as the Soviet Government has not recognised Manchukuo to this day.) Secondly, he says that the Comintern abandoned the boycott of German goods after the Soviet government concluded its trade agreement with Hitler's Fascist Government. It is very characteristic that both these slanderous charges brought forward by Mr. Brockway are a repetition of what the counter-revolutionary Trotsky had already said before, and which had, at the time, been sufficiently exposed by the Communist press. Monsieur Trotsky, who, before, had accused the Soviet Government for not giving up voluntarily its right to the Chinese Eastern Railway, later put forward the contrary thesis, an obviously provocative one, namely, that the Soviet Government should have a more active policy in the Far East, and should, instead of concentrating all its energy on Socialist construction, get into a war with Japan. With regard to Germany, Monsieur Trotsky gave the Soviet Government the same provocative kind of advice. He advised the Communist Party of Germany, during the sweeping advance of Fascism, to make a bloc with the German Social-Democratic Party, which cleared the road for Fascism, i.e., he proposed to the Communist Party to disarm and to abandon the revolutionary fight against Fascism. At the same time he proposed that in these circumstances of the ceasing of revolutionary struggle inside Germany, the Red Army should begin an offensive on Fascist Germany. Nobody could think up a more glaring example of counter-revolutionary provocative proposals. And here is Mr. Brockway following this well-trodden path which, as a matter of fact, the majority of the Social-Fascist parties is now following together with Trotsky.

Mr. Brockway's article in the "New Leader" against the letter of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. is the best possible proof of the truth of that letter, and of the fact that the masses of the I.L.P. membership can carry out the decision they adopted at the Derby Conference only if, in spite of their leaders, they make a united front with the Communists.

THE REPLY OF THE BRITISH I.L.P. TO THE COMINTERN

THE following letter of the Administrative Council of the I.L.P. was sent to the Executive Committee of the Communist International in July, 1933:—

Dear Comrades:

We received on June 24 your reply to our communication of May 18 and our further letter of June 19, which indicated the desire of the Independent Labour Party to find a basis of co-operation with the Communist International in our common task of revolutionary Socialist activity.

We welcome the view expressed in your reply that co-operation is desirable.

You do not refrain from criticism of the policy of the Independent Labour Party, and you indicate that the right to make comradely criticism must be maintained. We agree that such criticism is essential on both sides.

We have serious differences with you regarding the policy of the Communist International and believe that it is imperative, if correct tactics are to be pursued, that there should be constant and frank examination of Socialist policy.

In our view, the present disastrous position of the International Working-Class Movement is due to the failure of the policies of both the Labour and Socialist International and the Communist International.

The Social-Democratic and Labour Parties attached to the former have pursued policies of reformism and compromise which have proved disastrous in a situation which demanded a bold revolutionary lead and action.

On the other hand, the Communist International has pursued policies which have divided and weakened the industrial organisations of the workers and which, by treating sections of the working class outside its own ranks as enemies indistinguishable from the Fascists and the most reactionary capitalists, have prevented that united action by the working class which alone could have defeated the forces of Fascism and capitalism.

At the same time, we recognise that the Independent Socialist Parties have so far failed to rally mass support behind them. We realise that all sections of the working class have to learn the lessons of the present situation and to re-examine their policies with these lessons in view.

We make the following concrete proposals for co-operation :—

(1) In its desire to secure united action by the British working class the I.L.P. is already co-operating nationally with the Communist Party of Great Britain in opposition to Fascism and war and in the organisation of the unemployed and resistance to the capitalist attacks on the standards of life of the workers.

We are prepared to continue this co-operation on the understanding that its object is to bring about united action by the whole of the working class and that the right of inter-party criticism is retained outside the sphere of co-operation.

(2) The Independent Labour Party is prepared to extend this national co-operation to the international field, by participating in international efforts to mobilise the forces of the workers against Fascism, war and capitalist reaction. When international congresses are called for these purposes, however, there must be responsible collaboration by the parties invited to participate.

(3) The Independent Labour Party, in association with other Independent Socialist Parties, is striving to secure international united action by all revolutionary sections of the working class.

For this purpose we propose to call a world congress of all organisations which are prepared to co-operate on a revolutionary Socialist basis.

We shall be inviting the Communist Parties, together with other sections of the working class, to send representatives to this congress.

We hope that the Communist International will be ready to participate, with the object of developing united action by the international working-class movement against Fascism, war and imperialism, and the attacks of capitalism, and to go forward to the achievement of power for the workers, the establishment of Socialism and the creation of an international workers' society.

We ask for your early consideration of these concrete proposals and hope that from them a basis of united action may develop.

Yours fraternally,

JOHN PATON, Secretary.

TO THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY

September 17th, 1933.

COMRADES,—After we had given a clear answer to the question put by your Party Conference as to how the I.L.P. may assist in the work of the Communist International we received a letter from the National Administrative Council which made a series of absolutely unfounded charges against the Communist International, and brought forward a proposal to "call a world congress of all organisations which are prepared to co-operate on a revolutionary socialist basis" . . .

We consider that nothing useful can come out of such a proposal. If the National Administrative Council of the I.L.P., together with the independent fragments of social-democratic parties, calls a world congress, as stated in its letter, nothing will come of this except an attempt, foredoomed to failure, to resurrect the inglorious Two-and-a-Half International, as was proved by the recent Paris Conference of these organisations. We doubt if this idea will be received with any enthusiasm even by the members of the Independent Labour Party itself. At the Derby Conference, the representative of the National Administrative Council advocated the idea of an "all-embracing international" as against the resolution to approach the Communist International. But the majority decided for the latter. We believe that the members of the I.L.P. wish to adhere to the decision of their Party Conference, and do not wish to be dragged into new internationals with old bankrupt policies.

The idea of a "left socialist" world congress, which is advanced by the National Administrative Council, is basically the old idea of the I.L.P. which dates back to 1920. At that time also, in the conditions of the extreme radicalisation of the British working-class, the I.L.P. broke off its connections with the Second International, and the N.A.C. of the Party sent us a letter signed by R. C. Wallhead and Clifford Allen, in which, on the one hand, it enquired about the conditions of joining the Communist International,* and, on the other hand, informed us that the I.L.P. had "invited the Swiss Socialist Party to call a meeting of representatives of the left-wing of the Socialist Parties" on the question of "the possibility of restoring a *united all-embracing international*."

Experience soon showed where this "left" idea would lead. In 1921 the I.L.P. participated in the formation of the Vienna organisation of "left" Socialist Parties, and two years later, in 1923, this Two-and-a-Half International brought back to the

*See " The Communist International's Reply to the I.L.P."

fold of the Second International those radicalised workers who had left this treacherous International.

At that time, by means of this manœuvre with the Two-and-a-Half International, the left workers in a number of European countries were kept back for a long time from the common fighting front with the Communist International against the bourgeoisie. In Great Britain, this manœuvre guaranteed support for the bourgeois imperialist policy of the Labour Governments from those workers who were under the influence of the I.L.P., and made it easier for the leaders of the reformist trade unions to betray the General Strike in 1926. Further, this manœuvre prepared the way for a whole series of capitulations, without a fight, to the systematic capitalist offensive.

All this cost the British working-class a great deal. While the "left" reformists were talking very much about the "Living Wage" and even "Socialism in Our Time," they did nothing to organise the mass resistance of the workers to the everyday attacks of the capitalists and the Government. Millions of workers were thrown out of the factories on to the streets ; the situation of the unemployed worsened ; unemployment relief was reduced ; the Means Test was introduced ; the wages of the workers were cut mercilessly, etc. *Poverty and political reaction* were what the British working-class obtained from the policy of the Labour Party, instead of a "Living Wage" and Socialism.

This offensive cannot now go on so smoothly. The working masses cannot tolerate it any longer. They have become embittered, indignant, and they want to struggle for bread, for their cause. They no longer believe that "Ford has triumphed over Marx," as the Press of the I.L.P. often assured them.

At the present time, the radicalisation of the working masses in Britain is a fact, from which practical political conclusions should be drawn. We Communists put forward the task of organising the mass struggles for the defence of the vital everyday interests of the workers, for the liberation of the majority of the working-class from the influence of the reformists, for rallying together the fighting front of the proletariat, and organising international united front actions against fascism, the war danger, and the bourgeois offensive against the living standards of the working-class. But what could a joint congress of Social-Democratic and Communist Parties, such as proposed by the leadership of the I.L.P., give to the poverty-stricken working masses at the present time ? Nothing but illusions. The leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties do not want to struggle against the capitalist offensive. They want to continue their class-collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and a joint congress with them could only distract the attention of the workers from the necessity of a mass struggle in defence of their interests.

Could such a congress enlarge and strengthen the proletarian united front ? It could not. The social-democratic leaders are afraid of the united front of the working masses. In all countries they prohibit their supporters from participating in any militant united front activity with the Communists. Time after time, they rejected the proposals of the Communist Parties for a united front. They expelled Communists and other revolutionary workers who supported the united front from the trade unions, and, in addition, when our comrades organisationally rallied together the expelled members, they shouted that it was the Communists who were the splitters. The last conference of the Second International in Paris once more demonstrated the hostile attitude of this International to the proletarian united front.

All this proves that the united front of the proletariat cannot be established by conferences from above, with the lackeys of capitalism. It will have to be forged in every separate country by the everyday co-operation of the revolutionary and reformist workers in the localities, in the factories, in the trade unions, and by developing their joint energetic struggle against political reaction and the capitalist offensive. There is no doubt that this task can and must be carried out.

For the carrying through of these most important tasks of the revolutionary working-class movement, the assistance of the I.L.P. in the work of the Communist International could be of exceptional value. But some parts of the letter of the N.A.C. to us, and statements of prominent members of the N.A.C. (Brockway, Sandham, Jowett, etc.) during recent months, the breaking-off of the united front with the Communists by some leading functionaries of the I.L.P., give grounds for fearing that the intention of the Derby Conference to assist in the work of the Communist International may be frustrated.

In view of this danger, we are compelled to put the following questions :—

Firstly, at a moment when the example of German social-democracy is plainly showing to all the workers of the world how the parties of the Second International betray the cause of the working-class for the benefit of fascism, what does it signify that the N.A.C. of the I.L.P., instead of calling on the workers to carry on a determined struggle against the Second International, throws out the accusation against the *Communist International* that it "prevented the united action by the working-class which alone could have defeated the forces of fascism and capitalism" ?

This charge breaks down in face of the indisputable facts.

When the Hitler régime was in embryo, who was it that insisted on the necessity for the united action of the working-class in order to break the power of fascism ? Did not the Communist International make this proposal to the Social-Democratic Parties ?

Who was it that carried on a real struggle in Germany against the seizure of power by the National-Socialists? Among all the parties, it was the Communist Party of Germany alone. In vain it approached the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and the General Federation of Trade Unions (A.D.G.B.) to carry on anti-fascist actions on the basis of the united front. This was done on July 20th, 1932, against the *coup d'etat* in Prussia, and on January 30th and February 28th, 1933, against the dictatorship of Hitler. More than this, the Communist Party of Germany organised a whole series of militant actions with the participation of the social-democratic workers, such as mass strikes against the emergency decree of the Papen Government to reduce wages, the general strike in Lubeck for the liberation of the arrested social-democrats; it fought jointly with the members of the Reichsbanner against the closing of trade union halls by the fascists (Frankfurt, Dusseldorf, Hanover, Koenigsburg, etc.). But the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party and the reformist trade unions constantly restrained the workers from this common struggle by their warnings and threats. In addition, the social-democratic ministers and police presidents suppressed hundreds of anti-fascist actions of the workers by police force. These are the facts.

But, writes the N.A.C., the Communist International is "treating sections of the working-class outside its own ranks as enemies." No, we only look upon the Social-Democratic *Parties* and the *leaders* of the reformist trade unions as enemies, and not the trade union organisations and the social-democratic workers. But the Communist International, says the N.A.C., is treating the parties of the Second International as enemies "indistinguishable from the fascists and the most reactionary capitalists." No, we have always distinguished between them. The parties of the Second International do not openly defend the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, like the fascists, but under a democratic cloak. By their policy of support for the capitalist offensive, they clear the path for fascism, and then the fascists do their work. In Germany, the social-democratic leaders supported as a "lesser evil," the Governments of Bruening and Papen, whose emergency decrees so impoverished the masses of the people that millions of them in despair blindly swallowed the demagogic promises of Hitler. During the presidential elections, as we know, the Social-Democratic Party did not agitate for Hitler but for Hindenburg. But Hindenburg handed over the reins of power to Hitler. In the Hitlerite Reichstag, it was not the social-democrats who put forward the fascist programme of foreign policy. It was put forward by Hitler, and the social-democratic fraction "only" *voted for it*.

Thus, there is a distinction between the fascists and the social-fascists. But it is a distinction of such a kind that when the social-democratic workers see it they do the same as the members of the I.L.P. did—they turn their backs on the Second International and their faces towards the Communist International. But the N.A.C., noticing this, calls to the members of the I.L.P.: No, not only the Second International is to blame, but the Communist International as well.

What does this mean if it is not a concealed defence of the treachery of the Second International which cannot any longer be defended openly?

Secondly, at the very time when the N.A.C. is, writing us a letter on the necessity for "united action by the international working-class movement against fascism, war and imperialism," what does it mean that the chairman of the I.L.P. writes articles containing the worst kind of slander against the U.S.S.R., Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist International?

The Soviet Union is the bulwark of the world proletariat and the oppressed nations, against imperialism and international fascism. Therefore, the hostile policy of imperialism is constantly directed, above all, against it. All the world knows this. Everybody who wants, at the present time, to fight honestly against war and imperialism will fight first of all against the imperialist preparations for an anti-Soviet war, particularly on the part of British and Japanese imperialism. But what does Mr. Brockway do in his notorious articles on the seizure of power by the fascists in Germany? ("New Leader," June 16th, July 7th) They do not contain a word against British or Japanese imperialism, but, instead of this, a senseless libel that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union bribed the other parties of the Communist International so that they came out in the alleged interests of the U.S.S.R. for "acquiescence in Japanese imperialism" in the Far East and also "contributed to the victory of Hitler"! These slanderous statements are quite as bad as the anti-Soviet attacks made by Citrine at the Trades Union Congress.

In using such dishonest means, Mr. Brockway merely displays his own desperate alarm with the fact that, especially recently, the British workers are learning more about the enormous political and economic gains of the Soviet Union, and the more they learn, the more they become filled with revolutionary enthusiasm and go over to genuine socialism, an example of which is given by the victorious Soviet proletariat.

Thirdly, at a time when the I.L.P. adopts decisions for a united front and co-operation on a national scale with the Communist Party of Great Britain, what does it mean when some district committees of the Independent Labour Party either prohibit their organisations from carrying out any united front actions with the Communists (Lancashire), or refuse in general to discuss these questions with the repre-

sentatives of the Communist Party (South Wales) ? At the same time as the National Council is writing to us : "We are prepared to continue this co-operation,' a member of the N.A.C., Mr. Sandham, writes a circular on behalf of his district committee against this co-operation. At the same time as the N.A.C. is informing us on the readiness of the I.L.P. to assist in the work of the Communist International, the representatives of the N.A.C., at the Paris Conference, are zealously assisting the fight of the Independent Socialist Parties against the Communist International *for a social-democratic policy*, which only by its "left" phrases differs from the policy of the Second International. What does this mean ?

Allow us to state our opinion quite openly as to what it all means.

It seems to us that in your Party there are *two distinct tendencies*, two political *lines*. Many members of the Party are for the new line outlined by the Derby Conference, but many leaders are for the old reformist line. Many members of the Party are for an uncompromising fight against the bourgeoisie and the Labour Party, but many leaders are sabotaging the fight against both one and the other. Many members of the Party are firm supporters of the U.S.S.R., but many leaders are against the U.S.S.R. Many members of the Party want to get nearer to the Communist International and to co-operate with it, but many leaders want to get further away from it.

In short, many members of your Party are revolutionaries, but many leaders are reformists. To be more exact, they are "left" reformists. The latter are not quite the same as right reformists, the leaders of the Labour Party or "National Labour." What do the "left" reformists stand for ? They are in favour of a revolutionary policy in words, but in practice they are against it. They can accept a much more radical programme than the right reformists, but they do not cease their resistance to the revolutionising of the practice of the Party. They talk loudly about the united front of the proletariat, but act along the lines of conciliation with the Labour leaders and continue their co-operation with the saboteurs of the united front, such as Mr. Sandham, and in this way also helping the National Labourists and the National Government. Formally, they are for co-operation with the Communist International but actually, they are assisting its bitter enemies in the setting up of a new international body, for the purpose of holding back the masses from the revolutionary class struggle, by means of deceptive phrases and left manœuvres which are essentially directed against the Communist movement.

For a long time the I.L.P. carried on an openly reformist policy, supported the MacDonald Government, etc. Was this reformist policy correct or not ? The "left" reformists do not say. All they say is that now they want to carry on a "new policy," a "revolutionary policy," as there is now an economic crisis. But day and night, year in and year out, they are waiting for the end of the crisis so that it will be possible for them to restore their old policy. Thus, for them a "revolutionary policy" is only temporary, dictated by the bad state of trade, a crisis policy, with the aim of putting the masses to sleep.

"We also want Socialism," say the "left" reformists, "but by a pacifist technique of revolution." In other words, this means we do not actually want revolution, which brings all kinds of dangers. But if Socialism could be brought in without dangers and fights, either by a democratic vote in Parliament for a suitable Bill, or by means of the peaceful organisation of legal workers' councils, then we would have no objection to Socialism.

But the British bourgeoisie are emphatically against the fate of capitalism being decided by peaceful means. It is strongly armed and is in favour of using the most merciless violence against the proletariat. Its policy is a bloody one and its "democracy" is shown up as a class dictatorship. Its State is shown up as the apparatus of class violence.

Bourgeois class violence cannot be broken by "pacifist technique," but only by the class violence of the proletariat. The British working-class will be strong enough to do this, if its vanguard, its revolutionary movement and the united front will be strengthened. For this purpose it is necessary to take advantage of all actual possibilities and practical means, including the election campaigns and the Parliamentary tribune, to activise, to educate and organise the working-class and to win its decisive strata over to the side of the revolution.

Such is the line of a genuine revolutionary policy.

The reformists complain that the present political situation is "disastrous." Some of them resign (Mr. Paton, secretary of the I.L.P.), or seek a place in the camp of open reformism. Others twist and manœuvre desperately so as to hang on somehow, until the old times of stable capitalism return. But their calculations are mistaken. The capitalist system is bankrupt.

We say that the political situation is *favourable* for revolutionary work. A period of great class battles for power is approaching with the inevitability of historic law. This signifies the *possibility of great victories for the proletariat*. But everything depends on how the conscious revolutionaries carry on their work *at the present time* to prepare the working-class for these struggles for power.

For this purpose it is necessary, above all, to have a *clear political line*.

The path of the I.L.P. lies forward and not backwards ! Backwards means to bankrupt reformism. Forward means to *Communism*, which is already leading the working-class on one-sixth of the globe

from victory to victory, and which will grow and conquer in all countries.

We propose that the following questions be raised for discussion in all the organisations of the Independent Labour Party :

1. *What concrete mass actions on the basis of the united front of the C.P.G.B. and the I.L.P. can and must be carried out in the near future, with the aim of a successful struggle for a* 10 *per cent. wage increase, against the Means Test, and other similar demands advanced by the C.P.G.B. and the I.L.P.* ?

2. *Is it desirable for the Independent Labour Party to join the Communist International as a Party sympathising with Communism, with the right to a consultative vote, according to paragraph* 18 *of the Statutes of the Communist International* ?

We are aware that the latter question has been advanced by some members of the Independent Labour Party. We consider it timely for the Party to discuss this question fundamentally.

With Communist greetings,

O. Kuusinen,
On behalf of the Secretariat of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

THE AGITATIONAL WORK OF THE C.P.G.B.

EXPERIENCE AND SUCCESS IN AGITATION

DURING some of the campaigns recently conducted by the British Party, an improvement of the organisation of mass agitation was evident. This improvement applies particularly to the by-elections in East Rhondda and Clay Cross, to the struggle against imperialist war and in defence of the Soviet Union in connection with the embargo on Soviet goods, to the anti-fascist mobilisation of the masses against German Fascism, and also to the campaign in connection with the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Marx.

This experience must be more widely utilised and made known to the whole Party. In these campaigns the examples of mass agitation indicate the direction in which the Party must improve its work. They show what successes can be achieved if mass agitation is properly carried on.

The successes in the mobilisation of the masses during the by-election campaign in East Rhondda, where the Communist Party succeeded in getting nearly 12,000 votes against the Labour candidate or recently in Clay Cross, where Comrade Pollitt obtained 3,500 votes against Henderson in a district absolutely untouched by Communist agitation, were achieved chiefly because the Party combined the general slogan of the struggle against the capitalists, the the Government and the reformists with concrete slogans of local importance much better than formerly. In both cases the Party focussed its agitational activity on the question of the situation of the workers in these districts. It pointed out that the reformists bear the responsibility for the worsening of the situation of the workers. By concrete local experience it demonstrated to the masses the difference between what the "Labour" Government promised, and what it gave to the workers. By concrete local material the Party established the responsibility of the reformists in the local councils for the poverty-stricken situation of the unemployed. The Party also tried to show the workers concretely the revolutionary way out of the crisis. The popularisation of the revolutionary way out of the crisis was well linked up with the popularisation of the achievements of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., the improvement of the economic situation and the heightened cultural level of the Soviet workers.

Owing to this, our agitation became simple and comprehensible to the broad masses. At the same time it was carried on in the spirit of attack, not only against the bourgeoisie, but also against reformism, and also more convincingly and irreconcilably than has usually been the case in the practice of the Party. However, it should be mentioned that, even in these most successful cases, the Party did not always succeed in replying to all the arguments of the reformists. This especially applies to the arguments of the reformists. This especially applies to the arguments of the reformists that the Communists advocate violence for the sake of violence.

The "concretising" of our agitation, the inclusion of all the chief local questions in it, made it possible for the Party to receive also the organised support of the workers. Even in places where there was no Communist organisation, or, as in Clay Cross according to the workers themselves, "we never had any Communist agitation," even there it was possible to form wide electoral committees for the support of the Communist candidates, into which frequently sixty or more non-Party workers came and took an active part in mobilising the masses, carrying on agitation, etc. In these places we succeeded also in forming new Party organisations.

The linking up of our general political agitation with local questions and the demands of the workers made it possible to bring out various problems

beyond the scope of the district, such as the question of aid for the unemployed miners, the preparation of the struggle of the miners, etc. By means of agitation, these questions were brought home to the miners of the entire country.

These improvements and successes in our agitation were possible only because, this time, successful attempts were made to mobilise all the Party organisations and all the Party members, to acquaint them with the political features of the campaign, to discuss every stage of the agitation in the Party organisations in the course of the campaign, and to draw organisational conclusions which were not merely left on paper. The leadership of these campaigns was carried out in the form of direct personal contact by the Party committees and the leading comrades with the Party organisations. There were less written instructions and directives than ever, while the personal close contact of the higher Party committees with the cells and the Party members was stronger than usual.

CHIEF WEAKNESSES OF AGITATIONAL WORK

To remove weaknesses and shortcomings in the agitational work of the Party, we must use all the experience which we possess and build up the everyday agitational activity of the Party as a whole in such a way that it will correspond to the demands of the sharpening class struggles, and will be subordinate to the basic revolutionary tasks of the Party.

To mobilise the Party for the fulfilment of the tasks which were put forward by the XII Party Congress, and to attract new and wider masses of workers to the struggle it is necessary for the slogans of the Party to be brought to the masses ceaselessly, day after day, again and again, on every new occasion and in a new form. These slogans must be linked up among themselves. On the basis of everyday facts, OUR AGITATION MUST DISCLOSE THE ANTAGONISM BETWEEN THE WORKERS AND THE CAPITALISTS, BETWEEN A REAL WORKERS' POLICY AND THE POLICY OF THE REFORMISTS. Our agitation must arouse hatred in the masses towards the capitalist régime and indignation at the policy of the reformists. We must concretely show that we, and only we, defend the interests of the workers.

On the whole, the agitational activity of the C.P.G.B. is not at this level. Its chief shortcomings are as follow : In our agitation the political face of *the Communist Party is often absent*, and is frequently replaced by "objective" information. We do not sufficiently follow up the policy of the bourgeoisie and social-democracy, and in our agitation against them there is often missing the necessary exposure of this policy which would have the nature of an attack. We insufficiently utilise the experience of mass struggles, the experience of the working masses themselves, for new advances, for new fights.

Up to the present the Party has not been able to carry on its mass agitation in such a way as to help more or less wide strata of the British workers to realise the rôle of social-democracy as the chief social buttress of the bourgeoisie, so as to liberate these workers organisationally and ideologically from reformist influence. Our agitation against the reformists is often *not clear* politically, and sometimes strengthens the idea in the minds of not fully developed workers that both Parties— the Communist Party and the Labour Party—defend the interests of the working-class and carry on a struggle for socialism, that the difference between them is merely on the question of the method of struggle for socialism. The Party does not know how to utilise every incident in the current struggle of the workers, every manœuvre of social-democracy and the "left" reformists, in such a way that the workers will be able to see the difference in principle, between the policy of the Communist Party and social-democracy.

Our agitation against the reformists sometimes give the impression that we think that the working-class receives, from the "left" manœuvres of the social-democratic party, reinforcements and help in its struggle against the bourgeoisie, This can partly be noticed in the course of the campaign in defence of Tom Mann, during the "struggle" of the Labour Party and the reformist T.U. bureaucracy against the Means Test, etc. Our agitation does not always show to the workers that the demagogic speeches of the social-democrats on the question of the struggle of the workers, with the same demands as the working masses put forward in their struggle, are merely a manœuvre calculated on strengthening the position of the reformists, and not on the widening and deepening of the struggle of the proletariat.

* * *

Very frequently in our agitation we discover a lack of ability to organise *wide revolutionary mass* agitation which will be concentrated, above all, on the needs of the working masses in the *factories and in the trade unions*. Very often in our central organ we find articles from worker correspondents describing the conditions of work, etc., in their factories. In many cases these notes are not only of local importance. They bring forward important questions which touch on the interests of the widest masses. From this live material we do not know how to pick out just that which would give us the possibility of raising the struggle of the workers in the various factories and trade unions.

More profound reasons for these serious shortcomings in our agitation should be sought in the fact that our Party committees link up the material of mass agitation with the experience of practical mass work of the lower Party organisations to a very insufficient degree. There is still no close contact of the leading Party organs and agitators with the lower Party

organisations, and especially with the cells in big factories and with Communist fractions in important trade unions. The slogans and arguments of our agitation in very many cases are made up by office methods, there is no study of the demands of agitation, no attention to the information which the lower Party organisations and agitators collect in their work daily. There is not a sufficient *political* mobilisation of the Party cells for the mass campaigns of the Party, the political discussions which are held in the cells, which by the way have been very few, have little relation to the problems which are brought forward by current mass work.

HOW TO IMPROVE THE AGITATIONAL WORK OF THE PARTY

The agitation of the Party must serve the aim of carrying out the political tasks of the Party. From this it follows that in the near future our agitation must be given such a character that it will serve for *strengthening and widening the united front* of struggle of the workers under the leadership of the C.P. against the National Government and the offensive of capital, so that it will lead to the *exposure of social-democracy and the struggle against it.* In order to achieve this, the Party must introduce a series of changes both in the methods and in the organisation of its agitation. Let us deal with some of these points.

1. AGITATION AGAINST THE CAPITALIST OFFENSIVE

The capitalists, the Government and the whole bourgeois Press repeat day after day that the burdens of the crisis lie equally heavily on the shoulders of all strata of the population, that the capitalists are forced to cut wages and worsen the labour conditions of the workers, in order to be in a position to give them jobs at all, etc. The trade union bureaucrats and the Labour Party, as well as the right leaders of the I.L.P., talk about a successful struggle of the workers for increased wages in the period of the crisis being impossible, that the period of reform is over, that it is necessary to wait for new prosperity in industry, which can be reached by raising prices, or, as the "left" reformists say: it is necessary to wait for a revolution.

The task of our agitation is to carry on a tireless, stubborn struggle against all this bourgeois agitation. We must show that, regardless of the crisis, the big capitalist trusts, banks and monopolies receive gigantic profits at the expense of the workers. Such information can be found in the newspapers and journals almost daily. In utilising this concrete information, we can plainly show to all the workers that only the proletariat and the lower middle-class are carrying the burden of the crisis. Our agitation must show how the "good capitalists," led by Beaverbrook, who agitate against wage-cuts, in practice struggle for the same worsening of the workers' situation as all the other capitalists, but merely by other methods. They want to achieve their aim by inflation, raising of prices, etc. While acting "decisively against" wage-cuts, they simultaneously in a most violent way, agitate against the workers' wage struggle. On the basis of an everyday exposure of the needs and the poor situation of the great masses of workers and unemployed, on the basis of a comparison of these facts with the unheard of luxury and extravagance of the capitalist magnates, our agitation must increase the indignation of the masses. We have good examples of such a comparison. A number of our factory newspapers were able to mobilise a considerable section of the workers around themselves by such examples.

By showing and publishing in the Press concrete, *verified* facts, testifying that the reformist trade union bureaucrats and the leaders of the Labour Party are both politically and materially connected with the capitalists and by carefully refuting and exposing the social-democratic arguments, our agitation will be able, first of all, to arouse disbelief in these leaders among the masses. For it is clear to all workers that a trade union leader sitting in the London Transport Board will not be able to talk to the employers as a defender of the interests of the transport workers, when he controls transport jointly with them. All the workers understand that when MacDonald was leader of the Labour Party, the capitalists did not present him with an automobile because of his beautiful eyes. But here it is necessary to especially emphasise the importance of verifying facts. Very often the social-democratic and reformist workers blame us for publishing unverified facts.

Bourgeois agitation for the "coming prosperity of industry" must be resisted by showing concrete facts from the continuously deepening economic crisis, the growth of the contradictions of capitalism and the bankruptcy of the attempts at a "peaceful" elimination of these contradictions (the World Economic Conference, the Disarmament Conference). Such an event as the World Economic Conference gives us a magnificent opportunity to compare the decline of the capitalist world with the unceasing growth of socialism in the U.S.S.R.—and show by concrete facts the advantage of the Soviet system, in comparison to the capitalist. We can show the masses, that the promises of the capitalists to improve the situation of the workers in the period of the new "prosperity," are only given to lead the masses astray. The leaders of the bourgeois Government themselves, as for example, MacDonald, state that even in the best situation, in the conditions of "prosperity," there will be two million surplus workers in English industry. Our agitation will show the workers that

their situation will improve only as a result of the extension of revolutionary class struggle and in the long run, as a result of a proletarian revolution, an example which has been given by the workers of the Soviet Union.

In our agitation it is immediately necessary to point out that the British bourgeoisie is preparing for the same measures as Roosevelt is applying in America, for the purpose of further worsening the living conditions of the working-class and for "reviving" industry. The Labour Party and the leaders of the trade unions praise these measures as an example of "planned economy" and "the path to socialism." The recent congress of the English trade unions could promise nothing else to the workers but to carry out measures of the "recovery" of industry after the example of Roosevelt. The Labour Party and the reformist leaders of the trade unions, together with the bourgeoisie, are still using these measures to "overcome the crisis" to a greater extent to rouse a wave of nationalism, which is strengthening fascist development and helping in the preparations of a new imperialist war.

The measures of the Government in "overcoming the crisis" will consist firstly, in the carrying out of new waves of capitalist rationalisation. An example of this is the formation of the London Transport Board. Rationalisation will be expressed chiefly in speeding up the work, the spread of part-time work, in cutting the piece-work rates and introducing the so-called minimum wage which will reduce the wages to a really starvation minimum. Simultaneously with the attacks on the working-class, the Government is attempting to introduce various kinds of forced labour for the unemployed based on the so-called "social centres." Rationalisation measures will be accompanied by the use of inflation and the raising of prices, in connection with the increase of the subsidies given to the industrialists. Arbitration will be applied more than before and in a compulsory form.

In such a situation the central point of the agitation of the Party against the plans of the Government and capitalists becomes a question of the necessity of a proletarian united front for the organisation of the resistance of the workers.

The best agitation for the united front of the workers and for the possibility of successful partial struggles in the present crisis period is the popularisation of the experience of those mass actions, which were conducted by the workers themselves and which produced definite positive results. We have several hunger-marches and demonstrations of the unemployed, which have forced the Public Assistance Committees to increase the unemployment relief, to cancel the lowering of relief, etc. We have the experience of a number of important strikes, which ended in the victory of the workers. Our agitation for independent leadership of strike struggles, and for the necessity of forming a revolutionary trade union opposition movement in the reformist trade unions must not be conducted in an abstract form. We can rely on the fighting experience of the working masses in factories like the Firestone, Ford, and Hope's, etc. We have to widely encourage workers who took active part in these strikes, if only for simple talks or even personal conversations with workers in other factories, in lower trade union organisations—and at workers' meetings. By showing practical experience of our work, the workers can be convinced of the correctness of our slogans and our fighting line. The experience of these struggles must be made known to the masses by distributing leaflets and pamphlets, written in simple language, telling how a certain struggle was organised, how it was led and what the workers achieved. In the same way the masses must be shown what part our Party played in defending the interests of the workers and what help it gave to the workers in the struggle, and how the reformist trade union leaders sabotaged these struggles.

2. AGITATION AGAINST THE WAR DANGER

Recently the nationalist chauvinist propaganda of British imperialism and the Labour Party has considerably increased. This propaganda chiefly takes the form of advocacy of the "unity of the Empire," it calls for the defence of the Empire against the attacks of other countries and is united with the policy of high duties and attacks on "foreign dumping." Its edge is directed primarily against the Soviet Union. With the propaganda of unity within the Empire is connected the campaign against the U.S.A. on the question of war debts. Since the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, the British bourgeoisie have developed a new form of military demagogy: the propaganda of England as a stronghold of democracy against dictatorship. The bourgeoisie is attempting to turn this slogan into a slogan of building up a military bloc of capitalist "democratic" countries against proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union.

Our mass agitation against the war danger has been very successful. We do not pay sufficient attention to one side of this work, namely, the struggle against nationalism and chauvinism. Now we must specially strengthen this side of our agitation. By concretely exposing facts, by showing how the bourgeoisie conceals its policy of plunder by various "democratic" and pacifist phrases, the Party will be in a position to expose the chauvinist propaganda. The anti-fascist speeches of Hailsham, Chamberlain and others, do not in the least prevent the National Government from supporting the Hitler Government and using the co-operation of the German fascists for organising the intervention against the Chinese Soviets, and preparing war against the Soviet Union.

By the example of everyday facts in the simplest forms, i.e., avoiding general phrases, we must show the masses all the stages of the capitalist war preparations, as we were partly able to do in connection with the air pageant at Hendon. We must also show the concrete rôle of England as organiser of the anti-Soviet front. In this connection we conducted the exposure of the Four-Power Pact fairly well. Still very much remains to be done, especially in the mobilisation of all our Party organisations.

3. AGITATION AGAINST REFORMISM

For two years already the Labour Party has been "His Majesty's Opposition." It uses this situation, not without success, for strengthening its crumbling authority. It is conducting a campaign for a new "Labour" Government with a "Labour" majority in Parliament, and is recruiting new individual members although losing members through its collectively affiliated trade unions, and has increased the circulation of its paper, the "Daily Herald," to 2,000,000. In addition to the "left" phrases about "socialism" and about the struggle against the Means Test, the Labour Party is rejecting the united front with the Communist Party without hesitation and disseminating slander against the Soviet Union and proletarian dictatorship.

Faced with growing mass tendencies towards the class struggle and the united front, the Labour leaders demagogically say that the united front of the workers has already been brought about in the form of the Labour Party, the Trade Union Congress, and the Co-operative Movement. In our agitation we must concretely take up these questions. There are two united fronts : the united front with the capitalists and the united front against the capitalists. Together with the advanced workers from the Independent Labour Party, the Labour Party and the trade unions, the Communists are struggling in the united front under the leadership of the C.P. against the capitalist class, while the Labour Party and the trade union leaders are sabotaging this struggle, and are trying to disrupt it and organise a united front with the capitalists. The experience of the two Labour Governments, the policy of "cleansing" with regard to the revolutionary trade union members, the prohibition of committees of aid for the victims of German fascism by the Labour leaders, the anti-war movement, etc., plainly confirm our statements. In rejecting *the proposal of the revolutionary workers* of forming a united front of the working-class, the Labour Party leaders have a united front with the bourgeoisie and its National Government and support the policy of raising prices, the juggling wth currency and the reduction of output ; this was shown by the recent Trade Union Congress in Brighton. By focussing our agitation for the united front and against the Labour Party and its corrupt leaders on the burning questions of the struggle of the workers against the Means Test, against high prices for increased wages, against speeding up (the Bedaux System), we can obtain great successes in the practical formation of the united front of struggle, under the leadership of the C.P.

The attempts of the social-fascist leaders to conceal their own crime and that of German social-democracy behind the smoke screen of the campaign of "democracy versus dictatorship," must be exposed by our agitation as a new form of anti-Soviet propaganda, fully coinciding with the line of British imperialism in the sphere of the "defence of democracy." In this respect we were able—in connection with the election in Clay Cross—to do important work directed against Henderson. We were able to show to significant strata of the workers, the rôle of Henderson as a Labourite agent of British imperialism, who received special instructions to fool the workers by pacifist bunk on disarmament, and by this, to conceal the real preparations of the imperialists for war. But, as an offset to the calls of the reformist leaders to defend democracy against dictatorship, we have not yet sufficiently explained to the workers, that bourgeois democracy is the same dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. We have insufficiently explained to the masses that "fighters" for democracy, like the Hendersons and Citrines, i.e., the Labour Party and the leaders of the reformist trade unions, are clearing the way for fascism, they have passed along the path of development to social-fascism. *T*his must be *explained and proved* to the masses, and not merely asserted. The experience of Germany and the example of German social-democracy gives us an inexhaustible supply of arguments for our agitation, which should be linked up with everyday English reality.

In our agitation against the statements of the reformists, that "deep rooted" democracy in England is the bulwark against fascist reaction and therefore in England there is no danger of fascist reaction, we can show how such famous democratic institutions, as the constitutional monarchy, the House of Lords, the legal apparatus, etc., are adapting themselves to fascism and that the slightest faith in this "bulwark" of democracy will only weaken the fighting power of the workers against fascism. Our agitation must show that only the policy of the class struggle, carried to the point of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, will lead to socialism.

A special place in our agitation must be devoted to the exposure of the real meaning of the propaganda of "democracy versus dictatorship." The reformist leaders identify deliberately the conceptions of bourgeois and proletarian dictatorship, in the interests of the bourgeoisie. The meaning of all these actions does not in the least change owing to the paraphrasing of the anti-Soviet manifesto of Citrine

by the General Trade Union Council. Citrine only says openly what the General Council and the Labour Party are daily carrying out in practice and which, in view of the growing revolutionary feelings of the workers, they prefer to say more cautiously. The task of our agitation is to show the workers real proletarian democracy, which exists in the U.S.S.R., and to explain the rôle of the Soviet trade unions.

The social-fascist policy of the Labour Party creates innumerable possibilities on the basis of regular everyday facts, to expose the rôle of this Party as the main social buttress of the bourgeoisie, to show how it weakens and splits the working-class, and how it plays into the hands of the capitalists. It assists the policy of the National Government, it puts forward the same kind of resolutions (as was the case on the question of the World Economic Conference), and supports the oppression of the colonial peoples (the Indian Constitution, air bombardments in India, etc.). The proposals put forward by the Labour Party on "public corporations" are only for the defence of the interests of monopoly capital as is shown by the London Transport Board.

It is necessary to show that the policy of the Labour Party in favour of raising prices and the "currency control" can be carried on only at the expense of the working-class and that the Labour Party, in welcoming Roosevelt and in urging the National Government to follow his example, is a link in the general organisation of the offensive of the capitalists on the working-class. The statement made by the "Daily Herald" and the reformists, like Citrine, that "the boldness and energy of Roosevelt are equally applicable to the English and the American problems," must not be forgotten by the workers. The duty of our agitation is to show by the example of the development of events in America, and also by the experience of the British workers with the policy of Mondism, the whole anti-worker nature of the new "programmes of salvation" of capitalism, put forward by the Labour Party. At present Roosevelt has taken the place of Ford, with the reformists, as the conqueror of Marx. They praised Mond, praised Ford, now it is Roosevelt's turn. In contrast to this we use the propaganda of the revolutionary way out of the crisis, the propaganda of the teachings of Marx, Lenin and Stalin.

"DAILY WORKER"

A review of the "Daily Worker" for the last month shows that despite successes, which can be noted in the matter of a more simple style and giving prominence to the question of the struggles of the workers, the paper still reflects all the weaknesses in the agitation and propaganda of the Party. But besides this, the Party has its special inherent weakness, consisting of the fact that the main task of the Party, e.g., work in the *trade unions* does not receive *systematic* attention. The important questions of Party work, which are taken up by the newspaper, are not consistently developed ; drop out of sight and disappear from the paper.

The Party has planned a series of practical measures to strengthen political control over the paper. Primarily this refers to the strengthening of contacts between the editorial office and the Party and the readers, and to widen and renew the activities of the workers' press committee. This committee, first elected at the London Conference of Readers a year-and-a-half ago, has not been re-elected this year, but owing to insufficient leadership, has practically ceased to exist. And only recently was it possible to revive it again.

In carrying out militant actions of the Party, the task of the paper is not only to give information on the course of events, struggles, etc., but also to utilise the events for explaining and developing the political line of the Party. Every campaign must be dealt with in the paper daily during the whole campaign. This requires the regular working out of new arguments and a careful collection of information on suitable matters.

A decisive change must be made in the treatment of trade union work. In connection with the trade Union Congress in Brighton, there is already a definite improvement in this work. But this is insufficient. It is necessary to daily give better and more systematic directives, with regard to current trade union work. Articles on trade union problems must be regularly published, together with information on trade union life. It is insufficient to write only about the strike movement, it is necessary to talk to the workers about our attitude towards every kind of trade union question.

SOME CONCRETE QUESTIONS ON THE GUIDANCE OF AGITATION

A great weakness in our agitational work consists in the fact that the *Party organs* do not yet sufficiently take up the question of the concrete *organisation of mass agitation*, do not try to find new methods, which correspond to the growing radicalisation of the working-class. No serious attempts were made in order to arouse and strengthen the initiative of the lower Party organisations in the development of agitation. It is necessary for us to learn a great deal from the German Party, even if only the practice of the lower organisations to independently publish agitational material. In the vast majority of cases, the agitational material of our cells, and fractions is prepared by the local committees and sometimes even by the district committees. Naturally, this tremendously restricts the possibility of publishing concrete, local agitational material. This can only be eliminated if we teach *our lower cells to independently write and publish their agitational material.*

As a rule, we do not sufficiently attract the non-Party workers or members of the Labour Party into our agitational work. Apart from the political aspect there are also organisational reasons. We have no open agitational points, where we could gather not only Party members, but all others who desire to help in our work. It is true that during election campaigns we form such agitational points, in empty stores, workshops or private houses. But this is not characteristic of the arrangement of our daily agitation.

We are not yet doing enough to systematically distribute our agitational material. Up till now in our revolutionary agitation we have rarely used the open mass actions of the Labour Party, in which thousands of workers participate. In the future we must eliminate this weakness. We must construct all our agitational work in the way Lenin demanded :

" . . . that the Communist Party set forth its programme, so that the real proletarian, who, in co-operation with the unorganised and very much ignored poor, should go from house to house of the workers, from hut to hut of the agricultural proletariat and isolated peasantry, carrying and, distributing leaflets. (Fortunately, in Europe, there are fewer isolated peasants than in Russia, and fewer still in England.) The Communist should penetrate into the humblest taverns, should find his way into the unions, societies, and chance gatherings of the common people and talk with them, not learnedly, nor too much after the parliamentary fashion. He should not for a moment think of a "place" in Parliament ; his only object should be everywhere to awaken the minds of the people, to attract the masses, to trip the bourgeoisie up on their own words, utilising the apparatus created by them, the election contests arranged by them, the appeals to the whole people issued by them, to preach Bolshevism to the masses. Under the rule of the bourgeoisie this is possible only during an election campaign." ("Left-wing" Communism.' '—Lenin.)

THE LONDON "DAILY WORKER"

By W. Rust.

A REVIEW of the *Daily Worker* for the months of April, May and June, 1933, shows a certain improvement, as for instance, in the greater simplicity of expression. But at the same time, the review shows that the paper reflects the weakness of the Party's agitation and propaganda and that the chief tasks of the Party, as laid down by the Twelfth Plenum are not systematically campaigned for.

Especially is this to be noted in connection with the trade union work, where the main criticism is that the editorial staff has not sufficiently stressed the importance of the struggle for transforming the lower trade union organisations into instruments of class struggle.

During the period under review many strikes took place and the *Daily Worker* contained a great deal of interesting material regarding the economic struggles.

Some of the strike material was presented in a very simple and convincing way, such as, for example, the Briggs report report (April 5th) and a number of the Hopes' reports (this strike lasted eleven weeks). But it must be said that current information regarding the daily struggle is *still not sufficiently lively and agitational.* Most of the strikes received a summing up and the lessons of the struggle were dealt with. This was particularly the case with the lessons of the Irish rail strike, to which a great deal of space was devoted, and which continued to be dealt with as the paper reported the steps which were taken in order to build up a Vigilance Movement on the Irish railways. But this does not always find such clarification by a long way. Such is the case, for example, at the conclusion of the Hopes' strike, which was under Communist influence, but was insufficiently summed up.

The activities of the rank and file members of the movement received very little attention. Steps taken to build a movement among the miners were reported, as were the developments among the Irish railwaymen, but during the whole period only two or three articles on the need for building up a revolutionary trade union opposition were published.

Further, the *Daily Worker* does not sufficiently put forward the revolutionary line, as against the reformist line of the bureaucracy, in a popular concrete way. *The exposure of reformism usually takes place only when the leaders attack* the Communists and is confined to the issue concerned. It is not only necessary to answer the reformist leaders, on the question of Fascism, Soviet trade unions, etc. (this was done in the replies to Citrine), but *to take the offensive against the reformists on all* small and large questions, demonstrating with *concrete examples*

that only the policy of class struggle brings success.

The paper contains a great deal of material regarding the unemployed, the fight against the Means Test, demonstrations, marches, etc., and agitational facts are often effectively presented. But a systematic lead to the struggle of the unemployed is not given, especially so far as the building of unemployed councils is concerned.

The *Daily Worker* regularly publishes worker-correspondence columns, but the letters are mainly devoted to unemployment and housing and only a small percentage of letters are from workers engaged in industry, which gives the impression that there are only a few regular correspondents in the leading industries.

In the letters we hear about appalling working conditions, wage cuts, dismissals, but no concrete lead and help is practically given by the editorial board, which usually confines itself to stereotyped phrases such as "it is time that the workers should realise the necessity to do something about it!" The whole point is that instructions should be given on how actually to act, examples of successful struggles, etc.

On the other hand, we have examples showing how the worker-correspondence, if properly organised, could serve not only as an illustration of workers' living and working conditions under capitalism, but could be a mighty weapon helping the workers by passing the experience of one section of the working class to the other, assisting them to organise their fight, etc. For instance, three letters from Rolls Royce, dealing with conditions, and passivity of the union, awoke interest in other workers engaged in the same trade, who wrote to the paper not only about their conditions, but how they fought for their demands in similar circumstances.

One of the main things we should aim at, besides the *continuous lead* given by the *editorial board,* is that all these letters should call forth a wide response on the part of the workers themselves,who should feel induced to write and give a lead on the basis of their own experience.

The chief weaknesses of the united front campaign (which played a very big rôle in England during this period, because of the united front organised between the I.L.P. and C.P.) was the insufficient linking up with the current struggles, especially strikes and unemployed agitation. Further, the campaign was not systematic, the reporting by the local correspondents was very sparse and the editors frequently neglected the campaign, waiting passively for local material.

In general, many resolutions from trade union branches were published, but *almost always without comment,* despite the fact that most of them only protested against the refusal of the Labour Party and T.U.C. to agree to the united front, and said nothing about *action* for the united front in the localities concerned. A lead on this question was given only on May 5, when a leading article asked "how many resolutions are accompanied and followed by action," and pointed out that every resolution should be a "first step to common organisation and common action." Very little attention was paid to the organisation of the struggle and the setting up of committees of action.

Such general advice is necessary, but to be effective it needs to be constantly repeated and made very practical. This was not done. For example, a special general meeting of the London members of the Sheet Metal Workers' Union passed a resolution, with only one vote against it, in favour of linking up "with any attempt to organise the workers in a united front of struggle (May 2). This resolution was published without editorial comment. No reference to it ever appeared again, although it was just that type of resolution to which we should have returned over and over again, urging the members to see that it was really carried out. This resolution, it should be noted, was different from the ordinary type of resolution protesting against the line of the reformist leaders.

A tendency to cling to top negotiations is one of the main reasons why the *Daily Worker* right throughout April merely reported the trade union resolutions, and only began to suggest action in May.

Sometimes the line of the reformist leaders was incorrectly estimated, as for example, on April 7, when the *Daily Worker* wrote that "The campaign in Britain against the fascist terror in Germany is arousing ever-increasing protests . . . as can be seen by the decision of the Labour Party and T.U.C. to organise a protest meeting in the Albert Hall next week." This meeting was afterwards described as being directed against the Soviet Union rather than fascist Germany.

During the Moscow trial of English wreckers the L.P. and T.U.C.'s wire asking for the release of "fellow countrymen" (Thornton and MacDonald) was published under the heading, "Labour Anti-Soviet Move," *but without comment of any kind.* In the next issue of the paper it referred to this telegram again, but in no way analysed and exposed the policy of the Labour Party and the T.U.C. on this question. Social-fascist Brailsford was criticised on the 26th in connection with the trial, but the meaning of the official line was not dealt with.

During the whole of April the struggle against

reformism was very weak in the *Daily Worker.* During May and June, a large number of articles were printed in reply to the violent attacks which were being made by the Labour leaders, especially Citrine. This material included the reply of the N.U.W.M. to the T.U.C. letter rejecting the united front, a series of articles in connection with the T.U.C. replies to Citrine on trade unionism, replies to the reformist attack on the anti-war movement, etc.

But even in May the paper made errors in connection with reformist leaders, as was shown by the report of the South Wales united front conference, where the demagogic speech of the "Left" Labour M.P., Bevan (an associate of Beaverbrook), was described in glowing terms as a "splendid speech," "a rousing appeal," etc., without a word of criticism.

The *Daily Worker* should have conducted a regular check-up of the campaign of the united front in the various districts. This has not been done. Only one (South Wales) sent in an article, but this was general and in no sense an analysis of the local situation (May 31). Thus it was impossible to tell from the *Daily Worker* if the united front was being systematically carried out and what lessons it had taught, until the C.C. resolution on the united front was published on June 20, followed by an article a few days later.

The other side of the united front campaign, the ideological struggle to win the members of the I.L.P. for the revolutionary policy of the Comintern was well reported in the paper for a period. From April 4 up till the I.L.P. Conference, which opened on April 15, articles on this question were systematically published. On the 17th, the Open Letter of the Party to the Conference was published. *But it was precisely in the period after the Conference's adoption of the resolution in favour of co-operation with the C.I. that the campaign fell away very abruptly.*

On the 18th, there was a leading article welcoming the decision of the Conference on co-operation with the C.I. Also the decisions of the I.L.P. on the united front were published but without comment. (The reports of the conference proceedings were given very well.) Then followed a number of articles and letters.

But from May 4 to June 14, a period of nearly six weeks, not a word was written regarding the Conference's decisions in favour of co-operation with the C.I., and the resistance of the I.L.P. leaders to the adoption and carrying out of the united front, with the exception of one article published on May 22.

Only from the middle of June onwards the campaign sharpened up because of the Brockway article attacking the Soviet Union and the C.I. In July a fairly effective series of articles against Brockway was published.

The content of some of the material which appeared must also be criticised. In the period leading up to the Congress the "Left" reformist line of the I.L.P. leadership which sabotaged the execution of its own conference decision (against both internationals and for a new two and a half International) was dealt with in only one article and then very mildly.

On the other hand, its timely publication of the C.I. resolution and Heckert's articles on the German situation must be especially commended.

The Soviet Union is dealt with in every number of the *Daily Worker,* but, although the material is plentiful, it is desirable to give more information about Soviet industry. There is not enough concrete information about the difficulties of socialist construction in industry and agriculture, about the class struggle, about the everyday life of the workers in the U.S.S.R., about the life and rôle of the Red Army.

The life of the C.P.S.U. and its rôle is reflected only by one article about the cleansing of the Party. There is no mention of the numerous decisions of the Party and the Soviet Government, about the reorganisation of the coal-mining industries, about the harvesting campaign, about the rôle of the political departments of the machine and tractor stations, etc.

The *Daily Worker* publicity on the Metro-Vickers' trial was very large and good. It was well connected with a campaign of parallel exposure of the class sentence of British and other imperialists against unemployed, strikers and revolutionary fighters, as, for instance, the Meerut Trial, Scottsboro, etc. Very timely also was an article recalling to memory the twenty-six Baku Commissars shot by the British.

The weak point in the trial campaign is the insufficient exposure of the hypocritical attitude of the Labour leaders on this question.

The Embargo campaign had a very good effect and many resolutions poured in from working-class organisations and were published in the *Daily Worker.* But sometimes the articles and notes of the *Daily Worker* itself seem to be rather adapted to the more cautious formulations of some of these resolutions. Some of the articles and notes on this point, instead of exposing the preparations for counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R., refer chiefly to the fact that the Embargo means "trade wrecking," creating new unemployed and raising the cost of living in Great Britain. The issue of war in connection with the adoption of the Embargo is dealt with mechanically, in short phrases, without convincing explanations to the workers on how and why the Embargo

was part of the drive towards war. But nevertheless, thanks to one or two leading articles (*e.g.*, April 5) and the official Party statement, the point was correctly put. But take, for example, some of the big headlines in the Embargo issue, like: "Trade War Means More Workless," "British Industry Will Suffer from Anti-Soviet Embargo" (April 20), or the heading of the *Daily Worker's* appeal for protest resolutions published on April 26, "Protests at the Trade-Wreckers," and containing rather by the way a couple of words on "war-making" tactics. It was necessary to deal with the question of unemployment, but under no circumstances was it permissible to slip into a "nationalist" point of view, or to base the argument on the defence of the welfare and the interests of the industry and trade of imperialist Britain, to belittle at all the importance of the embargo as strengthening the danger of organisation of counter-revolutionary war by England on the U.S.S.R.

But in general, the campaign against the war danger has been kept well to the fore. The visit of the German Fascist, Rosenberg, to London and the imperialist plot for the seizure of the Ukraine were utilised well, as also the London visits of other Nazi chiefs. The campaign around the Hendon and other air pageants reached a high level and the paper definitely gave leadership and drive to the campaign.

A great weakness was the failure to present a general picture of the war situation, the line of the National Government on this question and generally to give a complete picture of the relations between Japan and Manchukuo on the one hand and the U.S.S.R. on the other.

This review points to the necessity of taking practical steps *to strengthen the political control of the C.C. over the paper* with the object of orientating it on the most important tasks of the Party, and using it as a weapon for raising the level of the Party's agitation. This means that the editorial staff should regularly discuss the application of the decisions of the Party and that questions connected with the *Daily Worker* should be considered regularly at the meetings of the leading organs of the Party. The co-operation between the Editorial Board and the members of the Party must be strengthened, and all leading comrades must give advice and assistance.

In carrying out the fighting campaigns of the Party, it is the task of the Editorial Staff not merely to report events but to utilise events in order to make clear, in an easily understandable manner, the line for which the Party is fighting. Every campaign requires constant daily treatment, the working out of new arguments in order to illustrate the line of the Party, the careful selection and prominent display of suitable facts (*e.g.*, in connection with trade union conferences, special prominence should be given to all expressions of opposition from local organisations), and the putting forward of timely and correct new slogans.

The *Daily Worker* should and can become a paper which responds immediately to all the most important political events, a paper which organises the *political exposure* of the government, the bourgeoisie and Fascism, the systematic exposure of Social-Fascism, a paper which organises and mobilises the masses for struggle under the slogans of the Communist Party of Great Britain.

A determined change must be made in the direction of trade union work. This means improving and systematising the lead that is given to the activity of the trade unions, and also greatly extending the space devoted to *examples* of good trade union work on the part of our comrades, the supporters of the minority movement, and to criticism and exposure of the reformist leadership of the trade unions. This is a quite feasible task and the *Daily Worker* can become an effective weapon for concentrating work in the trade unions.

Articles on trade union problems should be published regularly together with news reports. Such material should not only deal with strike movements, but with all kinds of trade union questions, which are of interest to the rank and file masses of both Party members and non-Party workers. Especially is it necessary to popularise the trade union opposition and to help its work.

In order to obtain the necessary material, the Editorial Board should attract worker-correspondents, appoint special trade union correspondents and mobilise the support of the Party. The *Daily Worker* should be represented by a special correspondent at all trade union conferences.

One of the most important tasks in the carrying out of the campaign is the mobilisation of worker-correspondents and the issuing of regular directives to them. This is one of the ways of carrying out the decision of the Twelfth Party Congress for the "sharper carrying through of the changes in the methods of writing (simplicity and convincing arguments) with the object of winning new adherents and not only convincing the circle of avowed adherents."

All possible assistance must be given to the newly-established workers' Press Commission, with the object of enabling it to function more actively. Previous commissions have not functioned well because of neglect of them on the part

of the Editorial Staff. This must now be changed by drawing individual members of the Commission into the work, carefully preparing meetings, quickly applying their decisions and regularly reporting their meetings in the paper.

The reader must be acquainted by the paper with Party life, with special attention to the experience of mass Party work.

Steps to remedy the fall in circulation since May must be immediately taken by all Party organisations and circulation drives initiated in various districts.

THE ROOSEVELT PROGRAMME OF INDUSTRIAL "RECOVERY"

By Leon Platt.

THE Roosevelt government came to power in the midst of the most deep-going crisis. No sooner had Roosevelt been inaugurated than a wave of bank crashes engulfed the country. Industrial production reached its lowest point. The capitalist press in its editorials wrote: "To-day American industry is crashing. President Roosevelt can save American industry. We believe he will try." Accompanying the sagging of American capitalist economy was the sharpening of the class struggle, a new wave of strikes—marked not only by their growing militancy, but also by the demand for wage increases. Hunger marches became more frequent and more militant, and so were the farmers' strikes and demonstrations.

In this situation Roosevelt began to shape the programme of American imperialism for "Industrial Recovery" and issued a call to all capitalists "to act together and at once" in order to carry through his programme. For the first few months of its existence, the Roosevelt government has adopted a number of measures for the co-ordination of the railroads, reorganisation of the banking system, cutting down of acreage under cultivation, re-financing of mortgages, etc. . . . However, the most important measure of Roosevelt, which summarises the major tasks outlined by the American bourgeoisie, in its attempt to get out of the crisis in a capitalist way, is the National Industrial Recovery Act (N.I.R.A.).

I.—WHAT IS THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY ACT (N.I.R.A.)?

Senator Wagner, who introduced the N.I.R.A. into the U.S. Senate, declared that this Act will "give industry a chance to co-operate within itself, and to organise within itself so as to do away with cut-throat competition." Agents of the government were announcing that, as a result of the N.I.R.A., American national economy will now be "planned" and production will be "organised."

No less promising was this N.I.R.A. presented to be, to the working class. According to Roosevelt, "this law is also a challenge to labour. Workers, too, are here given a Charter of Rights, not long-sought and hitherto denied." The bureaucrats of the American Federation of Labour, of course, immediately declared their unqualified endorsement of the N.I.R.A. In a special statement addressed to the workers of America the A.F. of L. declared:—

> "The hour has arrived when labour can be free, free to organise. Congress has established your legal right to organise. Workers everywhere should avail themselves of the opportunity thus presented."

The labour provisions of the N.I.R.A. were aimed, of course, at crushing the class struggle, at establishing class peace. The working class was urged not to undertake actions that might endanger the successes of the N.I.R.A.

The bourgeoisie wants to convince the workers that strikes to-day will bring no results because "it will be impossible for labour to extract blood from the turnip of a demoralised and bankrupt industry," as Dr. Barnes says in the *World Telegram* of July 6. Instead, the workers "must co-operate and help along planning and efficiency under capitalism."

However, it would be wrong to think that the bourgeoisie looks upon the N.I.R.A. as just a haphazard scheme of "stimulating" business. To do so would be to underestimate the seriousness with which the American bourgeoisie itself views the devastating effects of the four years of economic crisis upon the capitalist system as a whole. In a speech to the Merchants' Association, Mr. Richberg, the General Counsellor of the National Recovery Administration, as it is called, said:—

> "We came upon a day when not only the continuance of our social-economic system, but the very existence of our government, depended upon united and immediate action to stem the forces of the depression before the onrushing

hour of economic collapse and political chaos should arrive."

The damaging blows which the crisis is delivering upon American capitalism is not limited to the sphere of its economic life alone. No less fearful is American capitalism of the political effects of the crisis. Through the N.I.R.A. the American bourgeoisie attempts "to stem the forces of the depression before the onrushing hour of economic collapse and political chaos should arrive." At a conference of governors of 24 states, Mr. Dern, the Secretary of War, declared: "It (N.I.R.A.) seeks to save our democratic form of government." What are the methods the American bourgeoisie is using "to save our democratic form of government" and the carrying through of the Roosevelt programme in general? These methods are not "democratic," they are fascist methods fitted to the American conditions. Having entered on the road of intensified fascisation, American "democracy" is presenting the N.I.R.A to the workers of America as the only measure able to prevent dictatorship—both fascist and proletarian.

In the *World Telegram* of July 13 we read: "It (N.I.R.A.) is the only hope the United States possesses of competing with fascism and communism. Similarly, the A.F. of L. declared the N.I.R.A. "the only hope for the maintenance of the present institutions."

In the name of "saving our democratic form of government" the American financial oligarchy is unleashing a wave of terror against the revolutionary elements, who interfere with the execution of its hunger and war programme. They are robbing the working masses of their democratic rights, won through many years of bitter struggle, and are introducing in the United States their special forms of American fascism. They forbid strikes, and widely introduce compulsory arbitrage. This is what the N.I.R.A. and the programme of the Roosevelt government in general means to the masses of American workers. All the social-fascist praises of the N.I.R.A. as "state capitalism," "planned production," etc., everything that is attributed to the "radicalism" of Roosevelt are absolutely disproved by the bourgeoisie itself. Monopoly capital is strengthening its positions at the expense of the petty bourgeoisie. Under the banner of "Regulation of the utilisation of the productive apparatus" the concentration of capital and strengthening of monopoly rapidly proceeds. All the talk of Roosevelt about "selfish bankers," all the accusations of the *Chicago Tribune* against "the commissars in Washington" do not alarm American imperialism. Writing in the *Current History* magazine of July, Professor Francis Brown declared that, as far as Roosevelt planning is concerned, it "is not to be the planning outside the framework of capitalism." As if to prevent any misconception which the barrage of demagogy might create, and direct the various interpretations of the Roosevelt programme into the correct channels, a well-known writer of the Scripp-Howard press says on June 23: "It (N.I.R.A.) contains no threat to the institution of property and profit."

II.—THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

When initiating the N.I.R.A., Roosevelt said that not only "prosperity" but a more "permanent prosperity" would follow. Is prosperity returning in the U.S.? What do figures tell us about the present situation in the U.S.? It is true that from March till July the figures for industrial production have rapidly increased. The *Annalist* Index of Business Activity shows an increase from 58.5 points in March to 64.1 in April, 72.5 in May and 83.4 in June and 89.8 in July. The rise of production in individual industries is as follows: The index of pig-iron production rose from 16.8 in March to 64.4 in July. Steel ingot production rose from 19.5 in March to 92.7 in July. Freight car loading rose from 51.4 in March to 66.2 in July. Electric power production rose from 80.0 in March to 95.5 in July. Automobile production from 27.0 in March to 67.8 in July. Cotton consumption from 81.1 in March to 138.3 in July. To what factors is this rapid increase in production to be attributed? It is mainly due to two reasons: (1) Orders for war-construction material both for the United States and other countries (China, South America, etc.); (2) accumulation in warehouses of raw material and semi-finished products for speculative purposes in the expectation of increased prices due to inflation. Let us take, for example, steel production. For what purposes was the steel produced used? In the financial section of the *New York Evening Post* we read: "It is indicated that about 50 per cent. of the 1933 steel production is in the form of invisible inventories." The automobile industry was the major buyer of steel, but it consumed no more than one-eighth of the steel produced. The building and railroad industries, the major consumers of steel, used very little. Consequently, the steel produced, apart from the consumption by the army and navy departments, and the quantity put away on reserve, was used mainly in light manufacturing, hardware, etc. . . . What has been said about the steel industry applies to industrial production in general. In an editorial of July 20 the *World Telegram* declared:

"Much of the manufacturing recovery to-day

has represented merely a movement of goods from factory to stores, middlemen buying and stocking against further price rises. But *merchants' shelves are filling* and goods are not moving out in the hands of consumers with equal speed."

However, the increase in industrial production and the rise of the index of business activity is already past history. During the months of August and September the curve in industrial production was declining as fast as it was rising from March till July. In the middle of September the *New York Times* weekly business index lost half the gain made since March. Steel production in September stood below 40 per cent. capacity; automobile production in August was 28 per cent. below July. Contrary to seasonal trends, freight car loadings are declining. Early in September cotton consumption was cut in half compared with July. This shows how unstable was the foundation on which the spring and summer rise was based, how false were the prophecies about the end of the crisis, or its transformation into a depression.

It is very advisable to examine some other economic factors in the months of the "boom," such as new capital issues and investments. According to the Federal Reserve Board the total long-term corporate bond and stock issues for the first six months of the year in millions of dollars were as follow: January, 22; February, 1; March, ; April, 17; May, 4; and June, 12. *The Commercial and Financial Chronicle* of August 12 reports that during the month of July not one cent of long- and short-term *bonds* and *notes* were issued in the United States by corporations. There were, however, issued $52,893,807 worth of stocks. Of this, iron, steel, coal and copper industries have issued only $2,042,901; motors and spare parts only $556,838, and industries like equipment manufacturing, railroads, land and buildings, rubber and shipping, have issued not a cent. The bulk of the $52,893,807 of stocks in July were issued by breweries and liquor concerns. The failure on the part of the American corporations to invest new capital or renew their capital investments does not show much confidence of the bourgeoisie in this "recovery."

It is also worth while to take note of the situation in the machine-building industry. During the months of the "boom," the machine and tool-making industry has not kept pace with the general rise in industry as a whole. The U.S. Department of Labour reports that during the month of June, 1933, 68 per cent. of the machine-building establishments were working part time. Employment in this industry in May, 1933, was still 16 per cent. less than in May, 1932.

The going off the gold standard, and the Roosevelt inflation programme, in general, was regarded as a means of increasing exports, and the capture of new markets. If we are to judge on the basis of the growth of the imports and exports from April till July, 1933, then we can say that, in this respect, American imperialism was not very successful. Exports rose from $105,063,412 in April to only $144,197,334 in July, but imports have increased from $88,411,780 in April to $142,991,658 in July. In other words, the increase of exports was much less than the increase of imports. As a matter of fact, in June we had an unfavourable balance of trade of nearly $3,000,000.

Last but not least is the deepening agrarian crisis. The conditions of agriculture have not improved. The various relief bills enacted by the Roosevelt government were of great aid to the bankers and rich farmers, but not to the masses of poor and middle farmers. The attitude of the farmers to the Roosevelt programme was well summed up by the American correspondent of the British *Economist*, who declared:

> "In comparison with the situation as it appeared in July, the conditions of the farmer have abruptly changed for the worse, as farm prices have been falling and industrial prices rising. To the farmer, N.I.R.A. has been merely a device for increasing the price of things he buys; and it is reported that in distinctly agricultural regions the Blue Eagle is openly unpopular."

It is true the prices of agricultural products have risen for the last few months. But this does not mean that the farmers' income has increased. Incidentally, the prices of industrial goods have risen more rapidly than those of agriculture. First, because the prices of the commodities the farmer uses have also increased, as the *Magazine of Wall Street* stated on August 19: "He (the farmer) may well rejoice that cotton has advanced from a low price of around 5 cents a pound to 10 cents a pound, but how much will his new shirt cost?" Secondly, the farmer has the right to enjoy higher prices for his wheat and cotton only when he cuts his wheat acreage by 20 per cent. and cotton acreage by 25 per cent. Only then is the farmer entitled to the premium under the Processing Law, which is nothing but a tax upon the consumers. However, not even this premium goes to the farmer. The government will pay the premium only if the lien holder of the farmers' property who wants to reduce his cotton acreage, for example, will agree to it, and then checks will be made out payable jointly to the farmer and lien holder. However, the American bourgeoisie has proved unable to main-

tain dollar wheat and 10 cent. cotton, even though the planting acreage is reduced. The market crash at the end of July has sent wheat and cotton prices down more than 20 per cent.

We see that the recent upturn in industrial production was without any firm foundation. American capitalism is not only not getting out of the present crisis, but on the contrary, the policy of the bourgeoisie only accentuates the contradictions of American capitalist economy and thereby helps on the further disintegration of the economy of capitalism.

III. THE MEANING OF THE ROOSEVELT PROGRAMME FOR THE WORKING CLASS.

With the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act and the Blanket Code the Roosevelt administration boasted that it would immediately result in re-employment of millions of workers. General Johnson, the administrator of the Act, stated that by September 4, six million workers will find jobs. The Roosevelt administration also declared that as a result of this mass re-employment, the living standards of the American masses will rise, their consuming capacity will increase, and in this way, the crisis will be liquidated. Now, four months after the enactment of the N.I.R.A., and the adoption of the Blanket Code by 86 per cent. of the American factories and plants, it is proper to ask to what extent Roosevelt has really abolished unemployment, and how much the standard of living of the working masses has been raised.

In the information issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of July 26, 1933, we see that, as compared with the Index of Business Activity of 1923-25 (as 100) production increased from 59 per cent. in June, 1932, to 89 in June, 1933, whereas factory employment, on the basis of the same index, rose only from 60 in June, 1932, to 64.8 in 1933 and factory payrolls rose still less, from 42.6 in June, 1932, to 45.9 in June, 1933.

Here it is shown that the increase of production greatly outstripped the increase in employment. It particularly outdistanced payrolls. The number of workers who have returned to work in the course of this period is very small, and *the much advertised "increase" in wages is, in reality, a large-scale attack on the living standard of the working class. What did take place is more speed-up and more production per worker.* In fact, according to the Federal Reserve Board, in some industries (tobacco, food) June, 1933, as compared with June, 1932, while the index of production increased, the number of workers employed declined, and so have wages.

As far as the workers are concerned, this rapid increase in production has not resulted in much greater employment, nor in greater earnings. In summing up the economic situation, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Roper, declared that from February till July, while production has increased 45 per cent., employment increased only 9 per cent. and payrolls 15 per cent. However, we must be warned not to understand here the percentage of greater increase in payrolls over employment as due entirely to wage increases or to the increase in the number of workers employed. Russel Owen, writing in the *New York Times* on July 30, explains this as follows:

> "Those who have been employed have been working longer hours and on piece work, turnout more and so increasing their earnings. Therefore, payrolls have gone up at a faster rate than employment, but the increment is not spread as it should be over a larger labour group."

The American Federation of Labour reports that from March till May, 1,200,000 persons went back to work. This, however, does not mean that so many industrial workers have found employment. Concerning the composition of these newly employed the Federation says: "Much of the employment increase in April and May was due to the hiring of farm labour for spring planting and cultivating." The percentage of A.F. of L. union members employed was reduced from 34 per cent. in March to only 31 per cent. in June. In a number of cities the percentage of unemployed among the A.F. and L. membership during June even increased. In Atlanta, 1 per cent., Denver 3 per cent., Detroit 8 per cent., Omaha 14 per cent., and San Francisco 4 per cent.

The "unemployment abolition" plans were and remain capitalist demagogy. The predictions of General Johnson that six million unemployed will find jobs by September 4 did not come true. The decrease in unemployment is very insignificant compared with the still existing army of 16 to 17 million unemployed.

Now to what extent has Roosevelt with his programme of "recovery" increased wages and raised the living standards of the working masses?

In the Blanket Code Roosevelt's conception of high wages is a minimum of 30 cents per hour and the establishment of a maximum thirty-five-hour week which gives the worker a weekly income of between $10.50 and $14 (depending upon the tariff belt of the city). However, the minimum wage and maximum working week provisions of this Blanket Code must not be understood as a guaranteed minimum wage for a maximum working week. The minimum wage is only per hour, and the thirty-five hours is the

naximum number of hours the worker will be mployed per week under the Blanket Code.

While it is true that many thousands of Ameri- an workers are working for less than 30 cents er hour, yet it is also true that there are many orkers whose hourly wage is much higher and or them the code means an open cut in wages. And there are also workers who, though they are eceive a less hourly wage than what is specified n the Blanket Code, are working more than hirty-five hours and their total wages are more han $10.50 weekly.

From the first results of the application of the ode in the textile industry, we already witness hat textile employers are laying off higher paid orkers (above 30 cents per hour) and re-hiring hem or others at much lower wages. This of ourse is perfectly legal under the code, as the ages are not less than 30 cents per hour. This s one way of reducing wages under the Roosevelt rogramme.

The American bosses have also made it clear hat in cases where workers were working for ess than 30 cents per hour but more than thirty- ve hours per week, they will not be "patriotic" nough to pay the workers the same wages for a hirty-five-hour week, as they did, let us say, for orty-five or fifty-four hours per week. Upon the ublication of the Blanket Code the National ssociation of Manufacturers made the follow- ng statement:

> "If Paragraph 7 (of the N.I.R.A.) is inter- preted to mean that hourly workers must be paid the same weekly pay for reduced number of hours, then the contract in many cases becomes insupportable."

Even more frank in this respect were the extile manufacturers. In their organ *Fibre and abric,* they declared: "Forty hours or thirty ours, with a forty hours' pay, is too foolish to alk about, as labour is going to get in pay just hat it gives back in work, and anyone who elieves that forty-eight hours' pay is coming ith a thirty or forty-hour week is being fooled." This is another way how the income of the orkers will be reduced.

It must also, however, be noted that accord- ng to the A.F. of L. the average weekly wage f a factory worker in May, 1933, was still 17.47. At the same time Roosevelt in his lanket Code proposes a minimum weekly wage, ven for the workers who work the full thirty- ve hours, of $10.50 to $14. The great reduc- on in wages the American bourgeoisie is ttempting to put over on the workers is here ery clear.

The worsening of the condition of the work- g masses becomes especially outstanding when we compare the minimum wages offered by Roosevelt under his Blanket Code, the increased cost of living with the weekly budget of the workers. The *Annalist* Index of Wholesale Commodity prices shows an increase of 23.1 per cent. during the four month period ending with June. The Federal Reserve Board reports that from February to June, 1933, food prices also increased 20 per cent. The cost of living dur- ing the same period increased correspondingly. The American Federation of Labour gives the following weekly workers' budget:

	Individual	*Family of Five*
Bare Subsistence	$8.92	$26.18
Minimum of Health and Efficiency	11.90	31.23
Minimum Comfort ...	14.87	35.70

The above certainly does not show that the American bourgeoisie with its Blanket Code will be raising the consuming power of the workers and their standard of living. The contrary will take place. *Roosevelt's programme is a pro- gramme of starvation for the workers.*

Furthermore, Roosevelt's proposals of a thirty- five hour minimum working week as a means of increasing employment will actually only result in an extension of the "stagger system," that is distribution of work among a larger number of workers. While Roosevelt calls for a thirty-five hour minimum working week, the figures of the U.S. Department of Labour show that in April, 1933, the average working week was 37.1 hours and in May 38.6 hours.

And, last but not least, we must also take into consideration the important fact reported by the Alexander Hamilton Institute that since 1929 workers' productivity (per hour) has increased 13.3 per cent.

Therefore, even bourgeois statisticians have determined that in order to restore the buying power of the working masses to the 1929 level, the present wages of the workers will have to be increased 43 per cent., plus 13.3 per cent. to compensate the productivity increase. In other words, even bourgeois statisticians admit that wages must be increased at least 56 per cent. to bring them to the 1929 levels. But as becomes bourgeois statisticians, they avoid the question of how this increase of the intensity of labour leads to such a using up of labour power, which cannot compensate such a per cent. of increase, which only equals the percentage increase of intensity.

Taking all the facts and figures given above we can come to only one conclusion, namely, that the policy outlined in the N.I.R.A. Blanket Code, and the Roosevelt programme in general,

is only in the interest of the capitalist class, and as far as the working masses are concerned they are forced, by it, into still greater poverty and need. Life has not only exposed the demagogy of the social-fascists on "the raising of the wages and liquidation of unemployment," at the same time it has glaringly exposed the opportunist "theory" that a part of the American bourgeoisie, led by Roosevelt, are endeavouring to find a way out of the crisis by raising the real wages of the workers.

That is why American capitalists greeted the Blanket Code with such enthusiasm. On July 20, Percy S. Strauss, President of R. H. Macy and Co., one of America's biggest department stores, in speaking before the National Retail Dry Goods Association, said: "I say to you, we employers have sacrificed nothing in agreeing to maximum hours and minimum wages." A couple of weeks later Julius Kline, former Secretary of Commerce under the Hoover administration, stated: "The President's $14.00 wage rate per week would therefore not be out of line with the majority of sentiment in industry."

The practical consequences of Roosevelt's "high wages" resulted in deterioration in the material conditions of the working class, and therefore have not increased and cannot increase its consuming capacity. Evidence of this is found even in the turnover of the department stores, which is not only not rising, but is falling. According to the New York District of the Federal Reserve Bank, sales of department stores in that district, for the first six months of 1933, declined 14 per cent. as compared with the corresponding period of 1932. For the entire country the U.S. Federal Reserve Board reports that the index of department store sales, which stood in April at 68, has declined to 67 in May and 63 in June.

The New York department of the Federal Reserve Bank also reports that for the first six months of 1933 grocery sales of chain stores in the New York District dropped 12 per cent. compared with the same six months of a year ago. This shows that the masses don't buy more even of the prime necessities of life; on the contrary, they buy less.

WHAT HAS THE AMERICAN BOURGEOISIE GAINED FROM THE N.I.R.A.?

While the Roosevelt programme does not and cannot give American Capitalism a way out of the crisis, it nevertheless resulted in certain definite gains for the American monopolist bourgeoisie. The wave of speculation and inflation had already brought many millions of dollars in profits. Here are some facts:

The net income of the first twelve railroads rose from 3,573,000 dollars in June, 1932, to 11,769,000 dollars in June, 1933, i.e., by 229 per cent. During the second quarter of 1933 the U.S. Steel Corporation showed an income of 4,881,554 dollars, contrasted with a loss of 3,362,736 dollars during the first quarter of 1933. A compilation of the reports of 105 companies would show that during the second quarter of this year, they have made a profit of $58,524,217, compared with $12,934,887 during the first quarter. A leading member of the editorial staff of the *New York Times* reports that while on March 4 the average value of fifty representative securities on the New York Stock Exchange stood at a price of 50.5, the price of the same securities on July 12 was 94.2—an increase of 86.3 per cent. The market value of all securities listed on the New York Stock Exchange increased by 19 billion dollars between March 1 and the end of June.

The Roosevelt programme will also result in further concentration of industry, in the growth of the power of the trusts, and the perpetuation of monopoly prices. Moreover, the setting aside of the Sherman Anti-Trust law is a very helpful act of Roosevelt for the further growth of trustification. The drive against the small and medium enterprise will now take place on a large scale. Already Wall Street has decreed: "Inefficient business must go." The American petty-bourgeoisie, which traditionally carried on a sham trust-busting campaign and was at first hypnotised by the magic of the N.I.R.A., with the expectation that Roosevelt would establish some agreement under which it, too, will be able to share in the coming prosperity, is now already raising its voice in despair.

The *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* of June 29 writes: " . . . The Blanket Code, if put through in the ruthless way indicated, may result in . . . demoralisation of small business."

It is well known that finance capital, trusts and monopolies will be receiving big subsidies from the Federal Government. The nearly three billion dollars already distributed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation went to these trusts. The coming $3,300,000,000 public works programme is intended as another gift to trusts and monopolies. In addition to the $3,300,000,000 sucked from the pockets of the workers, the Roosevelt government has declared itself ready to advance $1,000,000,000 to buy bonds of "sound" paying institutions. At the Bankers' Convention the Roosevelt government proposed to the banks to give more liberal credit for speculative purposes, which the government is ready to advance.

Under the N.I.R.A. the American bourgeoisie s also aiming to impose heavier tax burdens pon the masses. In order to raise the prices f agricultural products, the bourgeoisie imposed processing tax on wheat and cotton which is aid directly by consumers of food products and extile goods. The insignificant increase that vas given to the dairy farmers in some cases has nmediately resulted in a many-fold increase in he prices of milk, which came as a heavy burden n the consumer. Furthermore, the American ourgeoisie is set on a policy of more inflation. The real inflation wave in the U.S. is yet to ome. The *Annalist* of August 4 declared that nore "inflation is definitely to be expected." In ther words, further reduction of the workers' ncomes will be effected, and the expropriation of he small savings of the petty-bourgeoisie hrough inflation will yet be undertaken on a vide scale. These are the inevitable economic onsequences of the Roosevelt programme.

But apart from the economic measures, the American bourgeoisie has set itself a number of olitical tasks in connection with the N.I.R.A. n the first place, at no other time in the history f the United States has finance capital got such old of the government machine as it has to-day. While Roosevelt was making speeches against 'selfish" and "dishonest" bankers, while the etty-bourgeoisie tried to present Roosevelt as ne president who will "take no orders" from Vall Street, finance capital was considerably trengthening its omnipotence.

The American bourgeoisie is now also proeeding energetically to the propaganda of hauvinism, in order to secure the possibility of arrying out its imperialist war plans. Amongst he masses the bourgeoisie is planting the deas that a new war will bring America back to rosperity, that the Roosevelt war construction rogramme is in the interests of the masses; and nder the pretext of abolishing unemployment hrough public works, the Roosevelt government s launching a gigantic naval building proramme, mechanising the army and initiating onstructions of military and strategic values. The Chairman of the House Naval Committee, epresentative Carl Vinson of Georgia, appealed o the workers to support the government naval uilding programme because "85 per cent. of hese $238,000,000 to be spent for naval-building will go into the pockets of the American shipard workers."

Roosevelt's plan of "planned production," the ndustrial codes, are in fact, in themselves war neasures. By these means the American bourgeoisie is making its economic preparations for war. The bourgeoisie's policy of economic nationalism, in its essence, consists in preparing the industrial machine and national economy in general, before it openly goes into a war against its imperialist rivals for a new re-division of the world.

In the new conditions of the eve of war, the imperialist bourgeoisie is already carrying out what Lenin wrote about in the middle of the first imperialist war:

> "Both America and Germany regulate their economic life in such a way as to create for the workers (and partly also for the peasants) a military *prison* and for the bankers and capitalists a *paradise*."

The third major political task the American bourgeoisie set out to accomplish under the N.I.R.A. is to crush any independent class action of the American proletariat and outlaw its revolutionary organisations. The introduction of N.I.R.A. is a serious step on the road to the accelerated "fascising" of the American bourgeoise. This, however, should be discussed in conjunction with the present strike wave in the U.S.A., and the changed attitude of the American workers to the government and its agents.

THE RISE OF THE STRIKE WAVE.

The Roosevelt government has created the most unrealisable illusions among the masses. The illusions became especially strengthened with the announcement of N.I.R.A. Needless to say, these illusions were fostered among the masses as a conscious policy of the bourgeoisie, which was not chary of demagogic promises. The spread of these illusions was facilitated by the propaganda of the A.F. or L. and the Socialist Party concerning the "New Deal." Especially has Roosevelt influenced the working masses with his so-called labour policy. The labour provisions of the N.I.R.A. read as follows:—

> "(1) That employees shall have the right to organise and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and shall be free from the interference, restraint or coercion of employers of labour, or their agents, in the designation of such representatievs or in self-organisation or in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection; (2) that no employee and no one seeking employment shall be required as a condition of employment to join any company union or to refrain from joining, organising or assisting a labour organisation of his own choosing."

It is precisely in regard to the question of labour organisation that the American workers have taken Roosevelt most seriously. The workers have interpreted the labour codes of the

N.I.R.A. to mean that now they really have a right to organise, to join and build the unions without fear and intimidation from their bosses. This feeling was especially trumped up by the A.F. of L. and the Socialist Party. We have already quoted declarations of the A.F. of L. which said to the workers "the hour has arrived when labour can be free—free to organise."

Norman Thomas, in stating his opinion on the N.I.R.A., declared: "The best feature of the bill is the recognition it gives to labour." The illusions created by Roosevelt were so strong that they even began to penetrate in some of our Party ranks and influence some unstable elements among our Party members. The entire Party must be mobilised for struggle against this capitulation to the offensive and demagogy of the A.F. of L., administering a decisive rebuff to this expression of Right opportunism.

Throughout the entire United States masses of workers seriously undertook the task of organising to demand higher wages. A strong will to organise and to join unions became a general phenomenon manifesting itself in all industries. It is a particularly characteristic fact that workers began to develop organisation activities in industries like lumber and steel, where, since 1919, because of the spy system and terror, no movement of any importance was developed. In many steel mills workers held their meetings and framed their demands right in the shop. In numerous cases workers have determinedly fought against and defeated the efforts of the steel companies to force them into company unions, and voted for the formation of their own unions. In instances where the employer succeeded in forcing the workers to participate in company union elections, the workers have defeated the bosses' candidates and elected their own candidates, placing their conditions before the companies for confirmation. When the companies refused to recognise the elected workers' delegates, or victimised them, the workers struck (Pennsylvania miners). Such events took place, and still occur, not only in steel, but also in lumber, glass, textile, etc. The prevailing opinion that "now the workers have a legal right to organise," which served as an important factor to stimulate strikes, and also the very fact that the workers' could not exist on the wages they were receiving, while through inflation and the rising cost of living their conditions became still worse, resulted in a spontaneous strike wave developing itself throughout the United States. The characteristic feature of these strikes is not only the militancy of the workers, but also the fact that they embrace all major industries and involve the most varied strata of workers, native and foreign-born, negroes, women and youth. The U.S. Department of Labour reports that we have now on strike over 300,000 workers — the biggest number for the last eleven years.

These strikes, however, have also soon shown the workers the real meaning of the "legal right" to organise, and the reasons for the A.F. of L. and Socialist Party leaders playing up so much Roosevelt's "New Labour Charter."

The A.F. of L. leaders have not only appeared in their traditional rôle as betrayers of workers' struggles, but in fact, became the instrument through which Roosevelt tries to force his hunger and war programme upon the masses, fulfilling, together with the Socialist Party, their rôle of chief social support of the bourgeoisie and its dictatorship, not under pressure, but conscientiously. As never before does the American bourgeoisie try to combine the A.F. of L. machine with the state, using the Federation to disarm any resistance of the workers to the government policy. While these mass strikes cannot yet be considered as the conscious workers' reply to the N.I.R.A., nevertheless, we cannot overlook the significance of the many strikes in the textile and mining industries, even after the Industrial Codes were adopted.

Of greatest interest are the first and second strikes of the Pennsylvania miners, and the silk workers' strike. The first strike of the Pennsylvania miners originated from the refusal of the coal companies to recognise the miners' checkweighmen and the U.M.W.A. It is this strike, more than any other action of the American workers since the coming of Roosevelt into power, which has shown to the whole American working class that the labour provisions of the N.I.R.A. are just a demagogic phrase never intended to be enforced, and that any effort of the workers to organise will be dealt with as much terror as in the past. The A.F. of L. leaders and Roosevelt have finally succeeded in forcing the miners to go back to work, under the promise that upon the consideration of an industrial code in the mining industry, their grievances will be settled.

In the course of this strike wave, Roosevelt announced his famous "moratorium" on strikes. This moratorium has actually meant that the class of capitalists in America has outlawed strikes. The well-known Washington political correspondent, B. L. Duffus, writes in *The New York Times* of August 6: "It is, in the first place, clear that the government can end any strike in any industry involving interstate trade by imposing a code upon the industry affected."

Nevertheless, in order to disarm the workers

their struggle for the right to strike, the merican Federation of Labour declared in the eptember issue of the *Federationist*:

"Working people cannot surrender the right to strike. The strike, in the last analysis, is the only power which they can effectively use in protecting themselves against the perpetuation of wrong, and in defence of the exercise of social and economic rights."

The Pennsylvania miners have soon convinced nemselves that Roosevelt is not going to protect neir interests, though a mining code was already dopted and the U.M.W.A. is partially recogised by the coal operators; 40,000 miners again truck in the first days of September. This strike s now spreading to the coal fields of West 'irginia, Kentucky and Iowa. This strike is irected, not only against the coal operators, but lso against the Roosevelt government and the odes which it has introduced.

A similar situation we see in the silk workers' trike, in Patterson, Allentown, etc. Though a extile code was already adopted, and an arbitraon board, to which the textile workers were to efer their grievances, set up, nevertheless, 85,000 ilk workers came out on strike.

These strikes are a clear indication of the eginning of the resistance of the workers to the oosevelt hunger and starvation programme.

The A.F. of L. looked upon the N.I.R.A. and s labour provisions as a means of rebuilding self with government assistance, to recruit new nembers and to get lots of money in membernip initiations. Though no doubt the A.F. of L. much exaggerating its successes in the drive, nevertheless made much headway. The A.F. f L. machinery is fully mobilised; it sent out undreds of paid organisers, but what is most gnificant is that the A.F. of L. appeared in such eavy industries as steel and automobile; in the ubber industry, where it never had any great nfluence, and also reappeared in industries where ne A.F. of L. once existed, but where its organation was smashed and its leadership discredited s much as in the mining industry. The other naracteristic feature is the new Federal unions. he A.F. of L. is establishing locals in large ants of heavy industry which are special kinds unions; with an A.F. of L. label on them.

Why has the A.F. of L. become so active, who ssisted them in their campaign? Although the merican bourgeoisie, headed by Roosevelt, are ndeavouring to create a mass basis for the A.F. L. and the Socialist Party, as the same time many branches of heavy industry the employers e displaying considerable opposition to the fficial recognition of the A.F. of L. This, however, is not at all contradictory to the fact that, in many instances, the employers supported the organisational drive of the A.F. of L. In places where the struggle is brewing, where the revolutionary unions have a foothold, for example, in the automobile industry, mining in the state of Utah and New Mexico, needle trades in New York, there the bosses themselves helped to organise the workers in A.F. of L. unions. However, there are capitalists who do not want any unions at all—not only the A.F. of L. unions, but even company unions. Why? Because the bourgeoisie knows that, under certain circumstances the workers can strike even though organised in company unions, as in the 1919 steel strike. And the experience for the last two years has shown that in spite of the A.F. of L. leaders, workers organised in the A.F. of L. unions will also strike.

It would be of interest to analyse the abovementioned new Federal unions in more detail. In the present strike wave it is to be noticed that workers, in spite of intimidation, have refused to join company unions. In fact, the U.S. Department of Labor attributes many strikes to the "strife between organised labour and company unions." The American bosses were therefore forced to seek another way of organising their workers, where circumstances forced them to do so, into unions which defend the interests of the bourgeoisie and betray the workers in their rôle and content, but would be coated in a real labour union dress. This purpose is served by the Federal unions. These unions are established in single industrial plants, to which all workers in the plant belong, and to whom the A.F. of L. issues a Federal charter. The workers meet, adopt demands, but only those working within the plant have a right to participate or represent the workers in the collective bargaining with the employers. As an organisation the A.F. of L. takes no part in the negotiations with the employers. These Federal unions, according to Green, are needed because "the old methods of organising workers in mass production plants must be abandoned." Many of the A.F. of L. supporters hailed these Federal unions as a "revolutionary change in trade unionism." However, sober observers even within the ranks of the bourgeoisie consider these Federal unions, as expressed by a staff writer of the Scripps-Howard papers on July 26, as an act indicating the abandonment of the organisation of the unorganised into unions. In the Scripps-Howard papers it was stated: "The new plan is being interpreted here [in Washington—L.P.] by some persons as an abandonment by Labour of collective bargaining rights under the Industrial Recovery Act."

The organisation of these Federal unions with A.F. of L. charters, which workers are induced to join as real labour unions (but which in reality are only company unions with an A.F. of L. label), is a most damaging blow to the working class, for the A.F. of L. bureaucrats are breaking down the efforts of the American workers to organise and build their class unions.

THE ATTITUDE OF AMERICAN AND INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM TO THE N.I.R.A.

The American Socialists came out jubilantly for N.I.R.A. Norman Thomas considered the N.I.R.A. as a "forward step to Socialism." The Socialist Party hailed it as an act establishing "industrial democracy." The Socialist Party began to advise the workers that since Roosevelt has already given the workers "industrial democracy," the workers must now prepare to "gain political power immediately," to make their "victory" complete. Repeatedly the Socialist Party and its press came out to the workers telling them that the "old capitalism is dead," that "the old days are dead beyond recall. The system of unbridled competition, of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost, can never return" (*New Leader,* July 29). The Socialist Party proclaimed the birth of a state capitalism, "organised" capitalism without anarchy of production. Wherever the Socialist Party has criticised Roosevelt it was merely because he has not gone far enough. They accused Roosevelt of stealing parts of the Socialist Party programme, etc.

No one of the Socialist Party leaders has so well summed up the position of the S.P. on the N.I.R.A., and the Roosevelt government, in general as Jacob Pankin. In a statement to the *New York Times* before leaving for the Paris meeting of the Second International, as the American representative, Jacob Pankin declared that the "National Industrial Recovery Act is one of the most revolutionary acts engaged in by any nation and is paving the way to state capitalism, state socialism and ultimately the establishment of social-democracy."

Therefore it is quite natural for those who consider the N.I.R.A. as the establishment of "industrial democracy," creating a "new" capitalism, which will be much more advanced than the old capitalism, to call for support of the N.I.R.A. Furthermore, if the Roosevelt programme is not the programme of American finance capital directed against the interests of the masses, if on the contrary Roosevelt's programme is leading to the ultimate "establishment of socialism"—then it is quite correct for the American Socialist Party to support Roosevelt.

This social-fascist ideology of the American S.P. helped Roosevelt to create illusions among the masses and disarm the struggle of the working masses against the hunger and war programme. The successful struggle against the Recovery Act cannot be conducted without a struggle against the Roosevelt policies of the Socialist Party.

No less enthusiastic about the Roosevelt programme and the N.I.R.A. are the international social-fascists. Of course, they support Roosevelt only in so far as it does not contradict the imperialist interests of their own national bourgeoisie. Just as during the Coolidge-Hoover "prosperity" days the much-advertised "high American standard of living," "permanent American prosperity," "peaceful American working class" was the idea which the international social-fascists and the bourgeoisie strove to establish in their own countries, do they to-day admire the Roosevelt programme, and try to bestow it upon the workers of other countries.

The official organ of the British Labour Party and trade unions, the *Labour Magazine* of August, 1933, proclaimed the N.I.R.A. as a "revolutionary measure of the first importance." While the American social-fascists, for the present, limit themselves to the characterisation of Roosevelt's N.I.R.A. as an act which will "ultimately establish social democracy," their British brethren go a step further. According to them, Roosevelt is already in part building Socialism. They say, "Mr. Roosevelt has set himself the task of translating some of the capital items of the socialist and trade union programme into practice" (Herbert Tracey, in *Labour Magazine,* August, 1933).

The present developments in the United States prove conclusively that the Roosevelt programme of industrial recovery is not getting American capitalist economy out of its present crisis. In fact, the crisis deepens and the contradictions of American capitalist economy become sharper.

The conditions of the workers and farmers and also of the non-proletarian strata become worsened. The aim of the American bourgeoisie to establish class peace was met with a wave of strikes and struggles of workers and farmers.

The American Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions are now already assuming the leadership of many of these struggles and bringing them to a successful conclusion, as we have seen in the mining, steel, textile, and shoe industries. As a result of their participation in these struggles, the revolutionary trade unions are growing in membership, and strengthening their organisation.

Some initial beginnings of the disillusion of the masses in the Roosevelt programme are already evident. The American Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions are faced with the great political responsibility of assuming, on the basis of carrying out the "Open Letter" of the Extraordinary Party Conference,* the leadership of the spontaneous strike struggles of the masses, and directing them along revolutionary channels, the channels of struggle against imperialism.

* See No. 19.

OUR ATTITUDE TO THE SOCIAL-FASCIST BOYCOTT CAMPAIGN

IN Germany the determined day-to-day struggle led by the Communist Party of Germany against the executioners' government of the National-Socialists is increasing. In other countries also the anti-fascist workers are rallying to the support of the heroic struggle of the German toilers. In France, in Spain, in Belgium, in Sweden, in Denmark and in Holland, Communist and Social-Democratic workers are boycotting the ships sailing under the swastika flag. The revolutionary workers oppose the detested agents of the Hitler government, and drive them away. The struggle against one's own fascism grows in every land. The workers, led by the Communist Parties, fight against fascism and the Second and the Amsterdam International, whose German sections paved the way for Hitler... These Internationals which have supported every step of German Social-Democracy and of the reformist trade unions against the proletarian revolution, *adopt paper resolutions* against Hitler. They adopt resolutions on the boycott of goods of German origin, as they now desire it to appear as if they want to struggle against fascism, while their demand to boycott this merchandise is merely dictated in reality, by the desire to protect the industries of their respective fatherlands against foreign competition. For this reason the resolutions of the reformist trade union centres and social-fascist parties proclaiming a boycott of German merchandise on the basis of the resolutions of the Amsterdam and the Second International, are now increasing in number.

Still greater, however, than the number of these paper resolutions not obligating anybody to any struggle against fascism, is the increase of cases where revolutionary workers, in countries governed by Social-Democratic ministers, receive severe punishment because they refuse to load and unload German ships sailing under the murderous swastika.

In *Denmark* where a so-called Labour government is administering the affairs of the bourgeoisie, in *Spain* where Social-Democratic ministers played a leading rôle in the government, such cases are no longer rarities. In *Sweden* where a Social-Democratic minister regulates the production and traffic in arms, immense shipments of arms and ammunition are sent to Germany, and simultaneously prosecutions are instituded against revolutionary workers for insulting the "honour" of the leaders of the German fascist bands of assassins. In *Czechoslovakia* where the Social-Democratic minister of justice, Meissner, safeguards the legal rights of capital through his jailers, German anti-fascist fugitives are deported across the border to Hitler-Germany. The same is done in *Holland* where the Social-Democratic Party notes the benevolent services of the Dutch government to Hitler without any protest. In *Belgium* the Social-Democratic Mayor of Antwerp, *Huysmans,* crushed the strike of the dockers directed against the swastika ships. In all these countries the police resort to arms against the workers who desire and wage a *real* struggle against German fascism.

So we find, on the one hand, boycott resolutions against merchandise coming from fascist Germany, on the basis of the resolutions of the Amsterdam and the Second International. On the other hand, sharp repressions are undertaken by the leaders of those parties and trade unions which belong to these Internationals, against the revolutionary workers who fight against German fascism and their agents, not in *words* but in *deeds*.

This *apparent* contradiction, between the Social-Fascist boycott resoultion against German fascism, and social-fascist punitive measures against the anti-fascist workers, resolves itself as soon as the *real reasons* of both these Social-Democratic measures are revealed in their inner inter-connection. Why punish the workers who boycott the swastika ships in Denmark, who go out on strike when called upon to load or unload such freighters?

Simply because the Danish Social-Democratic government, as the administrator of the Danish

bourgeoisie, has issued a general ban on strikes *for the protection of its own capitalism,* just as the fascist governments do.

In Spain the Republican potentates, among whom the Social-Democratic ministers but a few days ago played a leading rôle, likewise declared every strike illegal and punishable if not sanctioned by the public authorities. All these directly Social-Democratic measures (or measures supported by the Social-Democrats) against the working class aim to protect the interests of *their own* bourgeoisie as well as the bourgeois power and order of society. Violations of these ordinances to maintain law and order are punished in the interest of their own bourgeoisie. Likewise the declaration of a boycott of German merchandise on the part of the Social-Democratic leaders and the reformist trade unions is to serve the interests of *their own bourgeoisie,* of the protection of their own capitalism, whose capacity to compete they seek to promote. The boycott of German merchandise is sanctioned, inasmuch as this boycott is of advantage to the domestic *allies of the Social-Democrats and of the leaders of the reformist trade unions,* is of advantage to their own bourgeoisie; but it is sanctioned only to the extent *that it does not disturb the bourgeois order in their own country.*

This is the reason the Social-Democratic parties and the reformist trade unions do not seriously think of taking steps which alone could guarantee the consistent execution of their own decisions on the merchandise boycott. In other words, *they do not even think of a transport workers' strike.* There isn't a single case on record where the reformist trade unions or the Social-Democratic parties even made an attempt to put up a picket line of workers to check up and carry out the boycott of German merchandise. For this might interfere with the freedom of capitalist trade in one's own country, and would therefore be intolerable to one's own bourgeoisie. They therefore *commenced* the merchandise boycott at the point where the betrayers of the national revolutionary struggle in China, the Kuomintang leaders, *ended* the boycott of Japanese merchandise—that is, with the *betrayal of the consistent boycott.*

The revolutionary workers must see clearly that the merchandise boycott of German fascism is a deception, if isolated from the general anti-fascist struggle, if conducted without a transportation boycott. It cannot lead to the goal falsely pictured by the reformist trade union leaders and the leaders of the Social-Democratic parties—it cannot achieve a weakening of German fascism. The revolutionary workers must know that the reformist trade unions and the Social-Democratic parties are not seriously-minded even with this merchandise boycott. They do not want to mobilise the masses to carry out the boycott, because a mass mobilisation might disturb law and order in their own country. The revolutionary workers, primarily the Communists, will take part in every mass action which can strike a blow at German fascism. But they *will not allow themselves to be used as tools in the hands of one imperialist country against another.*

Revolutionary workers, anti-fascist toilers, whether they are non-party, or are still members of the class-betraying bourgeois labour organisations, can in no event allow themselves to be placated by the Social-Democratic and reformist deceptive manoeuvres concerning the merchandise boycott against fascist Germany. The international struggle against the bloody fascist dictatorship of finance capital in Germany can be conducted successfully in each country, only *if this struggle is directed simultaneously against one's own bourgeoisie.*

How can one believe that the merchandise boycott against Fascist Germany, which is announced by a party like the French Social-Democratic Party or by the reformist trade unions whose representatives vote for the war budgets of their respective imperialist governments, in whose ranks we find neo-fascists like Marquet, Marcel Deat and others, who openly aspire to the fascisation of France, who have entered into a reactionary united front with their own bourgeoisie, — that a boycott resolution coming from such quarters represents an act of *international class struggle?* What else is the significance of the boycott resolution of the Austrian trade unions and the Austrian Social-Democracy which actually support the Heimwehr-fascism which relies upon Italian fascism, as being the "lesser evil"?— what else is it if not participation in the action of the Dolfuss government and the Heimwehr-fascists? This joint action of the Austrian bourgeois and Social-Democratic parties is apparently directed against the German fascists, but, in reality, against their own working class in the general course of suppressing the proletarian revolution in the interests of the defence of Austrian capitalism.

The duty of the anti-fascist workers follows, however, from what has been said, namely, that the merchandise boycott proclaimed by the Social-Democrats is a swindle: continue the real struggle already commenced by the workers against bloody German fascism in all its manifold forms, such as protest demonstrations against the various manifestations of fascist terror, boycott of the agents of German fascism, etc. The organised driving out of the National-Socialist agents

abroad, as happened in London, is also an appropriate method of struggle against fascism if this struggle is linked with the struggle against one's own fascists. Refusal to work on ships flying the swastika flag, the struggle for the right of asylum of German anti-fascist fugitives, the struggle against any violation of the right of asylum extended to German anti-fascists are all directed at the same time against the bloody dictatorship of the Hitler bandits as well as against *one's own* government, against *one's own* authorities. These include the Social-Democratic party and trade union leaders in such countries as Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Sweden and Switzerland, which daily violate the once sacred rights of Democracy, the right to extend hospitality to political fugitives who have been driven from their own countries by counter-revolution—and are now driven back across the border. The great activity displayed in supplying material aid to the victims of fascism in Germany and moral and political support to the anti-fascist German emigrants is aimed against Hitler, as well as against one's own bourgeoisie and its social-fascist servitors; and so much the more so because the Social-Democratic and reformist party and trade union bureaucrats try to cause a split also in this activity by extensively advertising the Matteotti fund which has long ceased to exist. Boycotting German merchandise may also be included in the manifold forms of struggle of the foreign workers against bloody German fascism. But, in the first place, this boycott must be linked consistently with the *boycott of their transport,* that is, must bear the character of an *economic blockade* of fascist Germany. Second, this blockade must be organised at a moment when the revolutionary mass movement in Germany has already reached a high level, so that fascism is confronted with its direct collapse; the revolutionary workers carry out the struggle against German fascism in full accord with the revolutionary militant activity of the German proletariat, conducted under the leadership of the Communist Party of Germany, the only real anti-fascist party there, corresponding to the degree of the revolutionary class struggle in Germany itself at the given time. The German proletariat is preparing for the struggle to overthrow the Hitler dictatorship. Its leading party, the Communist Party of Germany, is the party which conducts the day-to-day struggle without fear or hesitation wherever these preparations are being made. But the incessant, indefatigable day-to-day revolutionary struggle against the Hitler dictatorship and all its political and economic measures must be conducted not only in Germany but also abroad, against this unbridled bloody terror if it is to guarantee decisive aid to the German proletariat in its struggle to overthrow the Hitler government.

The struggle against the German Social-Democratic Party is an integral part of this struggle. By splitting the working class this party not only lifted the Hitler hordes into the saddle but is now about to widen this split in order by this means to help prolong the life of fascism in Germany. The fight against the Social-Democratic swindle is an indispensable condition of this anti-fascist struggle. This swindle manoeuvre would have us believe that the Social-Democratic Party is an anti-fascist power, while its merchandise boycott is, as a matter of fact, nothing more nor less than a diversive manoeuvre whose aim it is to sabotage the real struggle against German fascism and against the fascism of one's own country.

The German proletariat and its leader, the Communist Party, have every right to demand of the entire international proletariat that it display a solidarity which is not to consist merely in passing resolutions which are tantamount to serving the ends of one's own bourgeoisie, but that it display its solidarity in deeds, in militant activity. *Nothing but a simultaneous struggle against one's own and against German fascism* can be of any avail to the German workers.

BELA KUN.

(*Continued from page 704*)

of Cuba do everything depending on it to prevent intervention and a really national armed resistance to it be organised if the U.S.A. do decide upon it.

The main and most important prerequisite for the success of these tactics is the organisational and ideological-political strengthening of the Party itself, the extension of its influence on the masses, the growth of implicit faith in it among the masses, and its winning of the leadership in the developing struggle of the revolution.

A NEW PHASE IN THE REVOLUTIONARY EVENTS IN CUBA

G. Sinani.

THE development of revolutionary events in Cuba after the military rising which deposed the government of Céspedes entered a new phase, which require that the Communist Party of Cuba, in order no longer to lag in the tail of events, combines great revolutionary activity with the greatest possible flexibility.

One of the peculiarities of the development of revolution in Cuba is the combination of an internal situation which is, on the whole, forming favourably; with very serious international difficulties, as a consequence of the close proximity of Cuba, to the mighty imperialism of the U.S.A., which is keenly interested economically and strategically in preserving a semi-colonial situation in Cuba.

The internal situation in Cuba was setting towards the end of September roughly as follows:

The *proletariat*, both industrial and agricultural, is carrying on an active attack for improving its position. Its struggle is not by any means confined to economic demands. The revolutionary struggle of the Cuban proletariat (strikes, demonstrations, street fights with the police) struck the principal blow to the dictatorship of Machado. But the working class of Cuba certainly did not intend to stop its revolutionary advance after Machado had been replaced by Céspedes, and Céspedes by San Martin. It continues to strike, demanding and achieving increases in wages (e.g., the dockers' strike in Havana). It practises ever more extensively the seizure of factory buildings to force the employers to grant its demands. It has achieved the legal existence of the C.P. and the revolutionary trade unions, which only a short while ago existed in conditions of the most extreme illegality, partly by seizing the right to it and partly by strikes. It is fighting for possession of the local organs of self-government, struggling for their real democratisation. It is precisely the working class that is the organiser and leader of the anti-imperialist movement of the great working masses, and in particular of the movement against the danger of intervention on the part of the U.S.A.

Simultaneously with the growth of the revolutionary activity of the working class its degree of organisation is also growing. New trade unions are formed, while the old are expanded. Factory and plantation committees are organised. Preparations are made for various trade union conferences to be called to create national trade union centres. The second conference of sugar workers (factory and plantation) has been carried through.

At the same time the relative density and influence of the revolutionary unions is rapidly increasing. Under the general guidance of the C.P. they are showing ever greater activity (leadership of the strike movement). The masses organised in the reformist unions are rapidly adopting a more Left position (railwaymen, tobacco workers, etc.). Ever more favourable conditions are being created, not only for the extension of our influence in the reformist unions, but also for winning them over.

The influence of the C.P. is growing greatly; by its active and leading participation in the mass revolutionary movement of the working class against Machado, in the development of which the Communist first of August campaign proved a great stimulus, and in the later struggle of the proletariat for improved conditions, it has proved its fighting ability, its close contact with the masses, and ability to lead them. At the same time, not only has the Communist Party of Cuba not yet overcome its organisational lagging behind its growing political influence by a long way; but this influence itself, to a very considerable extent, does not correspond to the opportunities created by the rapid development of the revolutionary crisis.

In the course of these events, the proletariat of Cuba, having won freedom of organisation and struggle, is rapidly being transformed into an armed class, organising, under the guidance of the C.P. and the revolutionary trade unions, armed detachments of workers' self-defence.

There can be no doubt that the disarming of the police, the seizing of police stations, small storage warehouses and so forth, have placed in the hands of the workers a large quantity of arms, which it is, of course, impossible to estimate at present.

The *peasantry*, crushed by the semi-feudal relations which reign both on the estates of the Cuban landlords, and in the possessions of American sugar and other companies and banks, and on the way to ruin under the blows of the crisis and the attack of the local ruling classes and imperialism, begin to enter ever more actively into revolutionary movement. The struggle against the landlords, against American landowning companies and the bloody régime of Machado, which was the watchdog of semi-feudal robbery

f the peasants, as early as the beginning of 933 led to a series of peasant risings (in the rovinces of Oriente, Camaguay and particularly anta Clara). These risings were crushed with reat cruelty; the punitive detachments took no risoners, hanging and shooting all who were etained. But in all these provinces, right up o the fall of Machado, detachments of partisans ontinued to fight.

At the present moment, as the military police error has been done away with, there are enor-nous possibilities for the rapid growth and the urther revolutionisation of the peasant move-ient. So far we have received less information bout concrete facts of revolutionary struggle in ie countryside than the movement among the orking class. But even those we have show iat in Cuba an agrarian revolution *is beginning*, i a number of places the peasants seize and hare out the landlords' land, cattle and imple-ients.

Before the fall of Machado the peasant move-ient was mainly spontaneous, and only in some istricts was guided directly by the C.P.; it was ius to a certain extent guided also by the bour-eois-landlord "National Opposition," which ttempted to gain its support in order to depose lachado. Even then the spontaneous peasant ovement would often outstep the limits of purely political" struggle against Machado's égime in which the "opposition" attempted to onfine them (e.g., when the peasants sacked ie estate of the opposition leader Menocalles).

There is no doubt that at the present time all ourgeois and bourgeois-landlord organisations onsider the revolution completed in the over-irow of Machado, whereas in fact it is only eginning.

They will try, and are already trying, to iminish the peasant movement at the very oment when it is surging up, when it is acquir-g an ever more clearly defined character as the volution of the poor and middle peasants and ie labourers against semi-feudal exploitation, gainst the rule of the landlords and of imperial-m. But this very fact creates even more vourable conditions for extending in the village ie influence of the C.P., which calls on the easantry to refuse to pay rents and debts and to ize the lands of the landlords. Ever more vourable conditions are forming for the political nification of the toiling peasantry around the ogan of a revolutionary workers' and peasants' overnment, which alone can provide land and her requirements for it.

The peasant movement is growing into an grarian revolution. However, it still remains ainly spontaneous and unorganised, *and lags ehind the movement of the proletariat.* But at the same time the importance of the peasant fighting committees and leagues of revolutionary peasantry organised on the initiative of the C.P. is undoubtedly on the increase.

Lastly, the peasantry is arming itself by disarming the village police, the guards of landlords' estates, plantations, etc. The Communist Party of Cuba is organising detachments of peasants for self-defence, making extensive use of the already existing partisan detachments.

In the towns the revolutionary movement is growing among the poorer sections of the *petty urban bourgeoise*, which finds expression, for example, in the revolutionisation of the Left wing of the students (the reorganisation committee, as it is called). Its main political slogan is, as yet, the struggle for the independence of Cuba, against the imperialism of the U.S.A., against all attempts at intervention, whatever the excuses under which they may be made. Precisely for fighting against possible intervention armed students' detachments are being formed in Havana and other towns of Cuba. At the same time, in the process of separation from the A B C and other petty-bourgeois and bourgeois-landlord organisations, which do not wish to fight against U.S. imperialism, there is an ever more clearly defined tendency among the anti-imperialist revolutionary student movement to come closer to the C.P., whose important task it is to become the leader of this movement.

Lastly, the processes now unfolding in the army have exceptional importance in determining the immediate prospects of the revolutionary movement in Cuba. There can be no doubt that the officers' rejection of extensive use of the army for crushing the incipient anti-Machado revolution by arms was not a result of a sudden sympathy on the part of the officers towards the anti-Machado groupings, but, first and foremost, a consequence of their fear of the masses of soldiers, an indirect indication that the latter are becoming more politically minded and sympathetic towards the national revolutionary movement. Further events—the mutiny of the soldiers under the leadership of the petty-bourgeois non-commissioned officers against the government of the U.S. agent Céspedes, and the arrests of Machadist officers by the soldiers — point sufficiently clearly to the awakening of political consciousness among the soldiers and their growing political activity.

The army is *beginning* to go over to the side of the revolutionary masses, the armed upholder of the ruling classes is wavering, an ever more favourable situation is forming for the development of revolution.

An exceptionally important task confronting the Party is the further deepening of the incipi-

ent process of political radicalisation of the army, support of the demands put forward by the soldiers and sailors and the practical carrying out of elections of soldiers' committees and of officers, in defiance of the old barracks discipline, to extend and consolidate the transition already begun of the army to the side of the revolutionary masses.

A united front of the bourgeois-landlord and bourgeois groupings (Right and "Left") of organisations under their influence which are petty-bourgeois in their composition (A.B.C., O.S.R.R., etc.) and, lastly, of American imperialism will be formed against the growing revolutionary advance of the working class and the middle and poor peasantry, against the growing anti-imperialist movement among some sections of the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the growing discontent in the army.

The American ambassador to Cuba, Wells, is working feverishly to bring this counter-revolutionary bloc together. At the present time the bloc has not yet been formed — the Machadists and the anti-Machadists are living in a state of open warfare, the A.B.C. has recently been removed from power by the soldiers' uprisings, which also forced the "Left" bourgeois group in the person of two professors, a lawyer, a banker and a *littérateur* into office. The "national" opposition is a conglomeration of bourgeois-landlord cliques competing with each other. However, the aim which Wells failed to achieve at the beginning of July, when he attempted to bring about an agreement between the Machadists and their bourgeois-landlord opponents for the purpose of averting the threatening revolution, he may very well achieve now that the revolution has begun, and when it threatens the fundamental interests of the Cuban landlords, of the bourgeoisie and of American imperialism.

In this way, the real situation in Cuba is characterised by a decisive alteration in the relation of forces between the classes, their *new* distribution, which is very considerably different from that existing under the dictatorship of Machado.

Power, at any rate in Havana, is undoubtedly still in the hands of representatives of the exploiting classes, "Left" though they may be, who are feeling about for the possibility of coming to an agreement with the imperialism of the U.S.A. behind the back of the masses, through some sort of petty concessions on its part. They have been brought forward on to the crest of the wave of revolution and dread the further development of the revolution. But, though formally still in power, they are far from full possession of it. The army has to a very considerable extent freed itself from the hands of the exploiting classes. For that very reason they are *at present* incapable of practically adopting methods of widespread repression of the maturing revolution, in spite of their hatred of it. For that very reason an exceptionally rapid growth of the workers' and peasants' movement is possible, for the "Left" bourgeois government is only beginning to make use of military and police repressions, and does not yet dare to apply them on the scale which would be necessary for the suppression of the movement.

But, at the same time, the forces of the revolution are far from being consolidated.

The influence of the Communist Party has grown enormously; the Party is well on the way to winning to its side the majority of the working class, but some very important sections (e.g., the railwaymen) are still mainly under the influence of the reformist and the renegade group of Junco. *The peasant agrarian revolution has begun, but it has not yet developed,* the great masses of the countryside have not been drawn into it, the peasant movement is still dominated by elements of spontaneity, it is characterised by considerable unevenness in various provinces and districts; the influence of the C.P. is increasing, its slogans mobilise the peasants for the struggle, *but the Party has not established the hegemony of the proletariat with regard to the middle and poor peasantry.*

Still further is the Communist Party of Cuba at the present moment from establishing the hegemony of the proletariat with regard to the lower, most exploited and politically suppressed sections of the petty urban bourgeoisie, which, as yet, are drawn into the movement only under the slogans which are directed against imperialism, and for whose support of the present agrarian revolution it is still necessary to carry on a ceaseless and energetic struggle. The army has begun to free itself from the hands of the exploiting classes, but *its transition to the side of the masses of the people is not yet permanent, not yet consolidated.*

The fact that San Martin's liberal government of "professors and bankers" (which is, in fact, undoubtedly connected with the landlords as well) was created as a result of the soldier movement against the government of Céspedes, which was "lawfully elected" by U.S. imperialism, shows clearly enough that the *C.P. continues to waste the opportunities which arise through the spontaneous action of the masses*—a fact which is particularly dangerous at the present moment.

In a word, to-day, at this moment (the end of September) the revolutionary movement among the workers and peasants is definitely in the ascendent, but neither its level nor particularly its subjective factor, *i.e.*, the Communist Party, ensure at present the possibility of bring-

ing about practically the *revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.* At the same time the counter-revolution is attempting at the present moment, after the overthrow of Céspedes, to pass from a state of increasing disruption of government to rallying and consolidation of its forces under the ægis of the American ambassador, who acts behind the scenes, but to-day it is *not yet* capable of transforming its tactics to a broad advance.

There can be no doubt that this situation is fraught with serious danger. The revolution and counter-revolution are competing to win time to close their ranks and consolidate their forces. Success in this competition will determine who will take the initiative in the future class battles for power.

It cannot be doubted that various counter-revolutionary actions will very probably take place in Cuba very soon, perhaps on the part of reactionary officers' groups or the A.B.C. There can be no doubt that U.S. imperialism, which would want, for external political reasons, to avoid open armed intervention in Cuba, is not only putting up a counter-revolutionary bloc of various cliques of the ruling classes of Cuba, but is also prepared to support and does support by material means (money and arms) any counter-revolutionary organisation or action.

In Havana itself, three hundred well-armed officers, turned out of the army by the soldiers, are still occupying one of the central hotels, where they have gathered under the wing of Wells. They are hostile, not only to the workers' and peasants' movement, but also to the government of San Martin, demanding the reinstatement of Céspedes. In order to prevent armed action on their part, the hotel is surrounded by machine-gun detachments. The A.B.C. still has some armed detachments at its disposal which in a number of districts of Cuba are already attempting to terrorise the mass revolutionary movement. The papers record a number of cases when soldiers of small unimportant detachments and the police fired on demonstrations. It is quite evident that the counter-revolution is still far from unarmed, that the ruling classes have not yet, as a whole, lost the leadership of the state apparatus of violence.

At present, attempts on the part both of San Martin's government to openly crush the revolutionary movement, and of bourgeois-landlord groupings connected more closely with the U.S.A. to overthrow this government, with the view to establishing an openly counter-revolutionary dictatorship are extremely probable.

The position of the San Martin government is becoming ever more unstable. At night the President's palace is guarded by machine-gun posts. San Martin himself has already declared several times, to the political groups supporting him, his intention of resigning.

And yet the present situation in Cuba is characteristic precisely as a situation of the period of *transition*, and can by no means be solved by a simple seizure of the "central" power in Havana by some reactionary organisation supported by the U.S.A. One of the proofs of this *transitoriness* consists precisely in the fact that the sphere of power of the "central" government has diminished greatly with the incipient (but only *incipient*) transition of the army to the side of the revolutionary masses.

The main masses of the proletariat and the peasantry have come into the revolutionary movement, which is expanding and intensifying more and more; the question of the further developmet of the Cuban anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution, which will be bourgeois-democratic in its first stage, can be fought out only in mass battles. The internal situation, as we have already seen, is at present undoubtedly favourable for uniting around the Communist Party the majority of the proletariat and for its winning the leadership in the peasant revolution, *i.e.*, for the creation of the most favourable conditions for the victory of the revolution. The situation in the army, making it more and more difficult for the exploiting classes to use it against the revolution, strengthens these chances many times over.

In this situation, the question of open armed intervention on the part of the U.S.A. and the moment when it is likely to take place acquires an exceptionally decisive significance.

Mobilising and organising the masses, guiding their revolutionary actions, struggling for influence over the soldiers of the old army and building the armed forces of the workers and peasants, the Communist Party of Cuba aims at taking all possible steps to prevent intervention, and at creating forces as large as possible for armed resistance in case the intervention does take place.

But this is possible only through making certain concessions to U.S. imperialism, by means of which the toiling masses of Cuba, under the leadership of the C.P., will attempt to avert intervention. Pursuing this very purpose, the Communist Party of Cuba is carrying on an energetic campaign explaining the growing danger of intervention and mobilising the masses against it, and, at the same time, aims at directing the main blow of the masses which are becoming revolutionised, first and foremost, against the local ruling classes in Cuba.

Pursuing this very purpose, extending the struggle of the working class for better conditions and gaining the leadership of it, the Communist Party of Cuba does not regard the seizure by the

workers of American factories and plants as likely to further the cause, and puts forward the slogan of workers' control, in carrying which out, the factory committees, provided the situation is revolutionary, will be able to bring about the fulfilment of the workers' demands.

Pursuing this very purpose, organising the peasantry, gaining the leadership of its struggle, and leading it towards the immediate revolutionary seizure of the land of the Cuban landlords, the Communist Party of Cuba does not regard the premature seizure of plantations which are the property of American capital, as likely to further the cause, and fights first and foremost for a lower rent on these lands, for annulling all old debts of the peasantry, and for better conditions for agricultural labourers.

Pursuing this very purpose, aiming at taking all possible measures to prevent intervention, the Communist Party of Cuba considers it necessary for a workers' and peasants' government, if one is created, though not rejecting the nationalisation of large-scale foreign property, to enter into negotiations with the government of the U.S.A. regarding the conditions of such a nationalisation, *i.e.*, it admits the possibility of buying this property. With the same end in view, the Communist Party of Cuba admits the possibility of maintaining part of the American property in the form of concessions, the conditions of which —as also the conditions of purchase (its price, the forms of the latter, the dates for it, etc.)— must be discussed by the future revolutionary government of Cuba, and the government of the U.S.A.

Foreseeing the possibility and necessity of these concessions to imperialism in order to ensure the easiest and speediest victory of the revolution, the Communist Party of Cuba considers that their usefulness will be quite clear and patent to the broad masses of the toilers, provided a proper explanatory campaign is carried out.

There can be no doubt that if the U.S.A. refuse to negotiate on these concessions, in spite of the openly expressed willingness of the revolutionary workers' and peasants' government, and if they make an attempt at armed intervention, such a position on the part of the C.P. will aid the organisation of a really national armed resistance to the interventionists.

We have already mentioned the fact that for reasons of international diplomacy the U.S.A. will obviously wish to avoid *open* armed intervention in Cuba. It would mean a great upsurge of anti-North American tendencies in all countries of South and Central America, the strengthening of British and partly also Japanese influence, and the collapse of those plans of subordinating to itself Central and South America which the U.S.A. have in view in preparing the December pan-American congress in Montevideo. The London *Times* writes openly that the success of the negotiations between the U.S.A. and the Argentine and the U.S.A. and Brazil, about the conclusion of trade agreements, depends on whether they will succeed in relieving the crisis in Cuba without intervention.

At the same time, open intervention of the U.S.A. in Cuba would be used by Japan for a "moral" justification of its aggressive policy in Manchuria and would place a powerful weapon in her hands for anti-American propaganda in China, Mexico and other countries. All this the U.S.A. naturally wish to avoid.

For that very reason they are attempting and, evidently, will continue to attempt, to crush the Cuban revolution through the local ruling classes in the future also. However, if the line indicated by the Communist Party of Cuba for the organisation and development of the revolutionary movement in Cuba (of which we spoke above) is followed, these attempts may be defeated.

The U.S.A. will then have to choose between a partial agreement with a revolutionary government in Cuba and open intervention, and the latter, as the experience in Nicaragua—a small country and one without a mass Communist Party—has shown, is no easy job even for the mighty American imperialism.

In outlining these tactics, which will require from the Party, great flexibility and ability to explain them to the broad masses of the toilers, the Communist Party of Cuba correctly estimates the difficulties of American imperialism and bases its line on mastering the experience of the world proletariat, and of the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.S.U. in particular..

In the present international conditions, the Communist Party of Cuba rightly combines a policy of great activeness in organising the revolution, in organising the workers, peasants and soldiers, in the struggle for the disintegration of the old bourgeois-landlord army and the creation of armed forces of the workers and peasants, with tactics of necessary concessions to imperialism.

Only in this way can the creation of a workers' and peasants' government which will really be supported by the masses be ensured, only on the basis of these tactics can the Communist Par

(*Continued on page* 699)

PRINTED BY BLACKFRIARS PRESS, LTD., SMITH-DORRIEN ROAD, LEICESTER, ENGLAND